

# LAW REVERSIONARY INTEREST SOCIETY, LIMITED.

24, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, W.C.

ESTABLISHED 1883.

Capital Stock ... £400,000  
 Debenture Stock ... £228,130  
 REVERSIONS BOUGHT. LOANS MADE THEREON.  
 Proposal Forms and full information may be had at the Society's Office.  
 W. OSCAR NASH, F.I.A., Actuary and Secretary.

## COUNTY FIRE OFFICE.

FOUNDED 1807.

50, REGENT ST., W., AND 14, CORNHILL, E.C., LONDON.

THE PREMIUM INCOME of this Office is derived from Home Business only, no foreign risks being undertaken.

THE RETURN SYSTEM of the COUNTY FIRE OFFICE offers an important advantage to Ordinary Insurers to Policyholders who continue insured in the Office. FORMS OF PROPOSAL and full particulars as to RATES and the ADVANTAGES offered by the "COUNTY" may be obtained upon application.

B. E. RATLIFF, Secretary.



## HIS MAJESTY'S JUDGES.

A UNIQUE SERIES OF PORTRAITS

of HIS MAJESTY'S JUDGES,

BEAUTIFULLY PRINTED ON INDIA AND PLATE PAPER.

"The Portraits have all the softness of a mezzotint, and, moreover, a dignity befitting the Judges of the King's Bench."—See PRESS OPINIONS.

From THE LAW PUBLISHING SOCIETY, 16, London-street, E.C.

### IMPORTANT TO SOLICITORS

In Drawing LEASES or MORTGAGES of  
 LICENSED PROPERTY

To see that the Insurance Covenants include a policy covering the risk of  
 LOSS OR FORFEITURE OF THE LICENSE.

Suitable clauses, settled by Counsel, can be obtained on application to  
 THE LICENSES INSURANCE CORPORATION AND  
 GUARANTEE FUND, LIMITED,

24, MOORGATE STREET, LONDON, E.C.

Mortgages Guaranteed on Licensed Properties promptly, without  
 special valuation and at low rates.

## LEGAL AND GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

ESTABLISHED 1836.

10, FLEET STREET, LONDON.

FREE,  
 SIMPLE,

THE  
 PERFECTED SYSTEM  
 OF  
 LIFE  
 ASSURANCE.

AND  
 SECURE.

FUNDS - - - £4,100,000. INCOME - - - £500,000.  
 YEARLY BUSINESS nearly £2,000,000. BUSINESS IN FORCE - £15,232,000.

#### TRUSTEES.

The Right Hon. Earl HALSBURY (Lord High Chancellor of England).  
 The Hon. Mr. Justice KENNICOTT.  
 His Honour Judge BACON.  
 WILLIAM WILLIAMS, Esq.  
 RICHARD PENNINGTON, Esq., J.P.

#### DIRECTORS.

Mathew, The Right Hon. Lord Justice.  
 Meek, A. Grant, Esq. (Devizes).  
 Mellor, The Right Hon. John W., K.C.,  
 M.P.  
 Morrell, Frederic P., Esq. (Oxford).  
 Pennington, Richard, Esq., J.P.  
 Rawie, Thomas, Esq.  
 Saltwell, Wm. Henry, Esq.  
 Tweddle, R. W., Esq.  
 Williams, Roderic, Esq., J.P., D.L.  
 Williams, William Esq.  
 Bacon, His Honour Judge.  
 Bagallay, Claude, Esq., K.C.  
 Davey, The Right Hon. Lord.  
 Deane, Henry Burgrave, Esq., K.C.  
 Ellis-Davies, Edmund Henry, Esq.  
 Fenn, Arthur J., Esq.  
 Fenn, Geo. Edgar, Esq.  
 Gower, C. E. H. Chadwyck, Esq., K.C.  
 Johnson, Charles F., Esq.  
 Kewley, The Hon. Mr. Justice.  
 Macdonald, Henry Chauncey, Esq.

VOL. XLVII., No. 52.

## The Solicitors' Journal and Reporter.

LONDON, OCTOBER 24, 1903.

\* The Editor cannot undertake to return rejected contributions, and copies should be kept of all articles sent by writers who are not on the regular staff of the JOURNAL.

All letters intended for publication in the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

### Contents.

CURRENT TOPICS.....	851	NEW ORDERS, &C.....	856
THE AMENDMENT AND CONSOLIDATION OF THE LAW RELATING TO TRADE- MARKS.....	854	LAW SOCIETIES.....	857
A READING OF THE NEW STATUTES.....	855	LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL.....	861
REVIEWS.....	856	LEGAL NEWS.....	861
CORRESPONDENCE.....	856	COURT PAPERS.....	862
		WINDING-UP NOTICES.....	867
		BANKRUPTCY NOTICES.....	868

### Current Topics.

THERE WILL be found elsewhere new rules (to be known as the Summary Jurisdiction Rules, September, 1903), which are substituted for the rules made (under section 10 of the Youthful Offenders Act, 1901, and section 29 of the Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1879) on the 4th of January, 1902: see 46 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL 175.

THERE ARE some noteworthy features in the lists of the Court of Appeal for the Michaelmas Sittings. Compared with the lists of a year ago, the aggregate number of appeals shows a considerable reduction. There were 402 appeals then and there are 348 now. But last year nearly double this reduction had been effected on the lists of the previous Michaelmas Sittings. The appeals from the Chancery Division, which numbered only 58 at the commencement of the Trinity Sittings, have risen to 102, while in the same period the King's Bench final appeals have fallen from 153 to 143. The New Trial Paper remains almost the same, but the workmen's compensation appeals have increased from 10 to 32.

THE CAUSE LISTS of the Chancery Division show an apparent, but not a real, reduction on the figures of a year ago. At the commencement of the last Michaelmas Sittings there were 475 causes and matters for hearing, while in the lists for the present sittings there are 377; but this is explained by the fact that a year ago Mr. Justice FARWELL's list contained no fewer than 161 actions by separate plaintiffs against the same defendant relative presumably to the same matter. It is not a little curious that the aggregate of the causes and matters in the lists for the present sittings is almost exactly the same as at the commencement of the Michaelmas Sittings two years ago, when the number was 376. At the same sittings three years ago it was 360. It would really appear that, for some obscure reason, the normal number of matters with which this division commences the legal year is somewhere between 360 and 380. There are forty-eight company matters in the present list.

THE KING'S BENCH cause lists have mounted up to not far off the record number of 928 causes at Michaelmas, 1901. There are 903 causes in the lists for the present sittings, as against 873 a year ago and 573 at the commencement of the last Trinity Sittings. Actions for trial account for 706 of the matters in these huge lists.

IN a newspaper report of the robbery of jewels from the premises of auctioneers, where they had been placed for sale, it is stated that the auctioneers had decided to make good the loss to the owners of the jewels, though an auctioneer's liability in such a case had never been clearly defined. We cannot see that the liability of an auctioneer as the custodian of goods differs in any way from that of other warehousemen. He is

bound to exercise reasonable diligence, due and common diligence, for the preservation of the commodity entrusted to him. It is impossible to ascertain with precision the precautions which at the present day a warehouseman may reasonably be required to take for the protection of property of exceptional value which is stored upon his premises. It is unhappily certain that great progress has been made in the science of burglary, and a jury may well think that precautions which would have been sufficient some years ago can no longer be relied upon, and that new and more costly appliances are required for the protection of property.

Forty-six public Acts of Parliament became law in the session which was prorogued on the 14th of August, including the County Courts Act, the Motor-car Act, the Poor Prisoners' Defence Act, the Employment of Children Act, and the Housing of the Working Classes Act. None of these last-mentioned Acts are as yet in operation, the commencement of the County Courts Act being postponed till the 1st of January, 1905, and that of the other Acts named until the 1st of January next. We would suggest that by a general Act all Acts should be directed to commence on the 1st of January after their passing, or some other fixed day, or on the expiration of some fixed period (say, three months) after their passing, unless the contrary should be expressed. The present rule, by virtue of the Acts of Parliament Commencement Act, 1793, is that *prima facie* all Acts commence on the date of Royal Assent—that is before they can possibly be printed, with the result that the King's subjects may become liable to penalties which the vast majority of them cannot possibly have known of. Before the passing of the Act of 1793 the absurd rule prevailed that an Act related back to the commencement of the session in which it was—an exaggeration of the salutary maxim *Ignorantia legis neminem excusat*, even more glaring than the practice of CALIGULA, who had his laws published in small characters on high places, the more easily to ensnare the Roman people into being penalized for law-breaking.

THE FACT that it is proposed to sell certain squares and gardens in Kensington for building purposes has led to some correspondence in the newspapers in which the rights and liabilities of those interested in such squares and gardens are discussed. The case of *Tulk v. The Metropolitan Board of Works* (L. R. 3 Q. B. 94 (Ex. Ch.) 682) is not without bearing upon the subject. In that case the Board had taken possession of the garden of Leicester-square under 25 Vict. c. 13, s. 1, which enacts that "where in any city . . . any enclosed garden or ornamental ground has been set apart, otherwise than by the revocable permission of the owner thereof, in any public square, &c., for the use or enjoyment of the inhabitants thereof (and has not been kept in proper order), the Board, or corporate authorities, shall take charge of the same." It was held that, whatever might be the rights at law or in equity of the owners and occupiers of the houses round the square, the garden had not been set apart for the use or enjoyment of the inhabitants of the square otherwise than by the revocable permission of the owner within the meaning of the section. The Board of Works, subsequently, by 40 & 41 Vict. c. 35, took power to acquire and hold open spaces for the benefit of the public, and it does not appear that the County Council, who have succeeded to the rights of the Board, have, apart from these Acts, any power over the squares in question. It would be difficult at the present day to accept an observation made by COCKBURN, C.J., in *Tulk v. Metropolitan Board of Works* without some qualification: "No one can doubt that it is much more advantageous, and enhances the value of property, to have ornamental open ground before it, rather than to have the prospect, perhaps at a very narrow interval, of so many brick houses in front." The value of land in the metropolis has increased so enormously since these words were spoken that the building owner seems to be unwilling to leave the smallest space uncovered.

AN INTERESTING decision as to the operation of a grant by deed where the grantee subsequently disclaims the grant was given by

BYRNE, J., in the recent case of *Mallott v. Wilson* (1903, 2 Ch. 494). By a voluntary settlement, made in 1866, real estate had been granted unto and to the use of a trustee upon certain trusts. The deed contained no power of revocation. In March, 1867, the trustee executed a deed disclaiming the real estate and the trusts, and in the following month the settlor executed a deed which purported to put an end to the settlement. This, of course, he could not do if the settlement had been effectively created, and this question in turn depended on whether the gift of the property upon the trusts declared had been completed by conveyance. It is, of course, a matter of every-day occurrence that property passes by a conveyance without any formal assent by the grantee, though the grantee, if he sees fit, can disclaim the grant and so put an end to its effect as far as he personally is concerned. And there are *dicta* in the conveyancing authorities which imply that such disclaimer avoids the deed altogether. In PRESTON'S edition of Sheppard's Touchstone (7th ed., p. 285) it is said: "The law presumes that every grant, &c., is for the benefit of the grantee, &c.; and, therefore, till the contrary is shewn, supposes an agreement to the grant. From the moment there is evidence of disagreement, then in construction of law the grant is void *ab initio*, as if no grant had been made: and in intentment of law the freehold never passed from the grantor." The effect of this, if taken literally, in the case of a voluntary grant in trust, would be serious, for by the disclaimer of the trustee the beneficial interests would be destroyed. It has been held, however, by BYRNE, J., that the words "void *ab initio*" are not to be pushed to this length. The estate, indeed, re-vests in the grantor as though a conveyance had never been made, but this does not get rid of the fact that a conveyance has been in fact made, and that the settlement has thereby been made binding. Consequently the trusts of the settlement still exist notwithstanding the disclaimer by the trustee, and the estate re-vests in the grantor subject to these trusts. Hence under the circumstances of *Mallott v. Wilson* the settlement was a subsisting settlement, and was not affected by the settlor's deed of revocation, no power for such purpose having been reserved in the settlement.

AFTER VIGOROUS demands for many years by judges, coroners, and magistrates, at last Parliament has dealt with the serious nuisance and danger caused by the indiscriminate sale of cheap revolvers to irresponsible persons. It is to be hoped that the Pistols Act, 1903, which is now law, will have the desired effect of greatly reducing that danger. The Act makes it an offence, punishable summarily with a fine of £5, to sell, or let on hire, a pistol to any person who does not produce a gun licence or a game licence at the time of the sale or hire. It also obliges the person selling or letting a pistol on hire to enter in a book particulars of each transaction, giving the date, the name and address of the purchaser, a description of the pistol, and particulars of the licence produced. A person under the age of eighteen is forbidden to buy, hire, use, or carry a pistol; and no one may knowingly sell or deliver a pistol to a person under the age of eighteen years. Exceptions are made to these provisions in favour of persons who are exempted from the necessity of having a gun or game licence by section 7 of the Gun Licence Act, 1870, as person in the army, navy, or reserve forces, servants of gunsmiths carrying a weapon in the course of their trade, and some others. A householder, too, who purposes to use a pistol only in his own house or its curtilage, and also a person about to proceed abroad for a period of at least six months, are exempt; but either of these persons must produce a statement to that effect signed by himself and also by a superior police officer or a justice of the peace. To knowingly sell a pistol to a person intoxicated or of unsound mind is a serious offence, for which the maximum punishment is fixed at a fine of £25, or three months' imprisonment with hard labour. These provisions are, we believe, sufficiently stringent to effect their purpose. At any rate, it will be difficult in the future for youthful roughs to obtain possession of deadly firearms for a few shillings. It seems probable, however, that some absurdities may occur from the very wide definition of "pistol." This word is defined to mean "a firearm or other weapon of any description from which any shot, bullet, or other missile can be discharged, and of which the length of the barrel,



not including any revolving detachable or magazine breach, does not exceed nine inches." The definition seems wide enough to include many articles used by boys which are really toys and not at all likely to be put to an improper purpose, such as small air-guns, and guns discharging a wooden dart by a spring. Whether such toys are practically suppressed by the Act remains to be seen. It may be argued that the word "weapon" protects them, and that a toy which is not likely to inflict any serious injury cannot be called a weapon. If this argument is bad, then every pop-gun is within the Act, and an officious policeman may interfere in a most unreasonable way with the amusements of children. The Act does not touch the sale of an antique pistol as a curiosity, but this does not apply to any case where ammunition is sold with the weapon, and there is reasonable ground for believing it to be capable of being effectually used.

IS THE mere belief of a man's family and relations that he is dead evidence in a court of justice to prove his death? This question was discussed in the recent case of *The Fidelity Mutual Life Association v. Mettler* (185 U. S. Rep. 308). Our knowledge of the death of a person with whom we have been acquainted is usually derived from the statements of his relations or associates or from a report furnished by them to the newspapers. The head of a firm who knows only by hearsay of the death of one of his clerks accepts the statement as true, and appoints a successor without further inquiry. But if upon the trial of an action an entry made by this clerk in the course of business was tendered as evidence, or it was proposed to read a deposition which he had made in a previous action, would the statement of the principal be sufficient evidence of the clerk's death? The principal would, upon cross-examination, be compelled to admit that his knowledge of the fact of the man's death was founded upon the report of his friends, coupled with the fact that the clerk had, without any explanation, ceased to attend at his master's office. Cases from time to time arise, both in the Probate Division and in other divisions of the High Court, where the question is, what evidence is sufficient to prove the death, and the time of the death, of a particular person. The most positive evidence of death is the testimony of those who can prove that they were present when it occurred, or that, having been acquainted with the deceased when alive, they have seen his body after his death. But it would not be reasonable to require such proof in the majority of cases, and a certified copy of the entry of the name of the deceased person in the register of burials, coupled with evidence of identity, is for all ordinary judicial purposes taken as sufficient proof of death. In cases of disappearance, it is necessary to go further in dispensing with direct proof. The jury are at liberty to infer the death of a person of whom nothing can be discovered, having regard to all the circumstances surrounding his disappearance. In *The Fidelity Mutual Life Association v. Mettler* (*ubi supra*), which was an action on policies of life assurance, the person insured had been traced to a river, and there were facts tending to shew that he had fallen into the water and had been drowned, but the plaintiff, by way of strengthening his case, called the father of the missing person and asked him, "What is the general reputation in the family as to whether your son is dead or alive?" The judge admitted the question, and the answer given was that the missing person was supposed by the family (father, brothers, and sisters) to have been drowned. The Supreme Court of the United States held, as might have been expected, that the belief of the family of the assured that he was dead was not admissible as independent evidence of the fact of his death. Insurance companies, in justice to their shareholders, are bound, before they satisfy a claim under a life policy, to require that all the conditions, including proof of death, are fulfilled. The necessity of furnishing this proof has in some cases led to the discovery of crime. But in many other transactions legal practitioners will think themselves justified in accepting the only evidence which their opponents can give in a case which is apparently free from suspicion.

THE DECISION of the Court of Appeal in *Wynne-Finch v. Chaytor* (1903, 2 Ch. 475) is of importance in that it overrules

two cases—one of them before the Court of Appeal—with regard to the procedure for setting aside a judgment entered in pursuance of a direction given by an official referee. By R. S. C. ord. 36, r. 50, taken with rule 52A, it is provided that an official referee shall have "the same authority . . . in the conduct of any reference or trial, and the same power to direct that judgment be entered for any or either party, as a judge of the High Court." And ord. 40, r. 2, declares that "every referee to whom a cause or matter shall be referred for trial, shall direct how judgment shall be entered, and such judgment shall be entered accordingly by a master or registrar, as the case may be." The natural effect of these rules seems to be that, so soon as judgment has been entered in pursuance of the referee's direction, the power of the High Court in respect of the matter is exhausted, and a party who wishes to question the judgment must do so by appeal to the Court of Appeal, and this view was taken by KAY, J., in *Serle v. Fardell* (38 W. R. 733, 44 Ch. D. 299). Considering that that case has governed the practice for over twelve years, it might perhaps have been allowed to stand without question, but in *Wynne-Finch v. Chaytor* the Court of Appeal has reconsidered the matter and has arrived at a different result. Order 40, in rules 4 to 6, gives specific directions as to the mode in which a judgment, either of a judge or of a referee, can be set aside on the ground that it is wrong upon the finding as entered. Where an application for this purpose is made after a trial by a judge, it is to the Court of Appeal (rules 4, 5). Rule 6 gives the right to make a similar application after a trial by a referee, and concludes: "Provided that in the Queen's Bench Division such motion shall be made to a Divisional Court." The rules, therefore, provide expressly that the motion to set aside the judgment of a judge must be made to the Court of Appeal; and that the motion to set aside the judgment of a referee must be made in the King's Bench Division to a Divisional Court. But the case of a referee's judgment in the Chancery Division is not provided for. In *Serle v. Fardell* this set of rules was not referred to by KAY, J., and, as already stated, he found in ord. 36, r. 50, sufficient reason for holding that the appeal from the referee must be to the Court of Appeal. In the present case the Court of Appeal have held that the proper effect of ord. 40, r. 6, is to leave the judgment of the referee under the control of the judge to whom the action is assigned. It is before him that, in general, subsequent proceedings take place, and the rules do not debar him from interfering with the referee's judgment. It is to him, therefore, that an application for this purpose must be made.

THE CASE of *Wynne-Finch v. Chaytor* (*supra*) raised also a question on the construction of section 1 (5) of the Judicature Act, 1894. This provides that "in all cases where there is a right of appeal to the High Court from any court or person, the appeal shall be heard and determined by a Divisional Court constituted as may be prescribed by rules of court; and the determination thereof by the Divisional Court shall be final, unless leave to appeal is given by that court or the Court of Appeal." *Prima facie* an appeal from the judgment of a referee is an appeal to the High Court from a "person," and, according to the direction of the rule, it should be to a Divisional Court, and the decision of that court would be final unless leave to appeal were given. This view was taken by the Court of Appeal in *Daglish v. Barton* (48 W. R. 50; 1900, 1 Q. B. 285) in spite of the argument that the official referee was the High Court, and that hence there could in strictness be no appeal from him. "The official referee," said A. L. SMITH, L.J., "is only a limb of the High Court, and to say that he is the High Court, in my judgment, is not the truth, and not common sense." And VAUGHAN WILLIAMS, L.J., did not dissent, though he expressed doubt as to the true meaning of sub-section 5. In *Wynne-Finch v. Chaytor* the Court of Appeal have overruled *Daglish v. Barton*, and have held that the official referee is for this purpose the High Court, and that an appeal from him is therefore not within the sub-section, which only applies to appeals to the High Court from inferior courts. This confirms the result already stated. An appeal from a referee is to the High Court, but only in the King's Bench Division need it be to a Divisional Court. In the Chancery Division it is to the judge having seisin of the action.

THE ARMY ACT, 1881, by section 144, provides that soldiers shall not be liable to be taken out of the service of the Crown by any process, execution, or order of any court of law or otherwise, or be compelled to appear in person before any court of law, except on account of a debt exceeding £30. This exemption does not extend to commissioned officers, who are, *prima facie*, subject to the ordinary civil law in respect of any debts which they may contract. In *Hamilton v. Coningham* (1903, 2 Ir. Rep. 564), an order having been made for the payment of a judgment debt by instalments, the debtor made default in the payment of an instalment, and an order was obtained for his committal to prison under the Debtors Act. The debtor was an officer in the army, and there was no evidence that he was in receipt of any income other than his ordinary pay. By section 141 assignments of, and charges on, the pay of an officer are void, and the question before the Irish court was whether it could be said to be against public policy to enforce the order for the committal of the defendant to prison, inasmuch as it enabled his income to be charged in execution. We cannot see that, in the absence of express provision, the case presented any difficulty, and we are rather surprised that it was taken to the Court of Appeal. The debtor had not appeared upon any of the applications, and it would not have been easy in his absence to discover anything as to his private means. The court, in affirming the order, said that the application was not for an attachment of the debtor's pay, and that the case of an officer did not differ from that of anyone in receipt of pay or salary as a public servant.

## The Amendment and Consolidation of the Law Relating to Trade-Marks.

### II.

At present the registration of a trade-mark is never indefeasible; it can be attacked at any time by a motion to rectify. The Bill to which we referred last week (*ante*, p. 827) proposes to alter this by providing (clause 41) that, subject to the provisions of the Act, registration shall in all legal proceedings be, "in the absence of fraud," conclusive evidence of the right to the exclusive use of the trade-mark upon the goods for which it is registered after the expiration of five years, upon the registered proprietor proving a continuous user of the trade-mark to a substantial extent for the five years immediately preceding the commencement of the legal proceedings, and that "user" shall be deemed to be continuous if there has been no actual interruption of the same for a longer period than twelve months. Having regard to the way in which attacks are so often made upon the registration of trade-marks which have been upon the register for very many years, this provision does not appear to be undesirable, but its effect will greatly depend upon the interpretation that the courts place upon the words "in the absence of fraud." Does "fraud" mean fraud by which the registration was procured, or does it extend to fraud committed after registration—*i.e.*, fraudulent user of the mark when registered? Beyond this, of course, it cannot possibly extend. In lieu of leaving this conundrum to be answered by the courts at the expense of the trading community, we think the matter should be set at rest by the Bill, and that instead of "in the absence of fraud," the provision should run "unless the registration of the trade-mark was procured by fraud, or unless the trade-mark when registered has been fraudulently used."

The Acts at present in force put old trade-marks (*i.e.*, trade-marks which were in use before the 13th of August, 1875) in a more favourable position in one respect—namely, that any special and distinctive word or words, letter, figure, or combination of letters or figures, or of letters and figures, may be registered, notwithstanding that, but for this provision, they would not have been registerable. The Bill proposes to continue this privilege for two years longer, after which time there would be no distinction for the purposes of registration between a word trade-mark used before the 13th of August, 1875, and a word trade-mark which has come into use subsequently.

Before discussing the next provision to which we wish to draw attention, we must point out that the Bill contains a provision enabling the Board of Trade to make rules, prescribe forms, and generally do such things as they think expedient, subject to the provisions of the Act, for (among other things) regulating the practice of registration under the Act. Such rules must be laid before Parliament in the usual way and with the usual consequences, but the Bill provides that the rules set out in the First Schedule to the Bill shall be the rules in use at the coming into force of the Act, subject to amendment by rules made by the Board as aforesaid. In reality these scheduled rules require more careful consideration than the text of the body of the Bill.

The provision we now propose to consider is that which enables an applicant for a trade-mark whose application has been refused by the Registrar to appeal to the Board of Trade, who may refer the bill to the court or give leave to the applicant to appeal to the court from its decision. In one case (*i.e.*, where the applicant can prove to the satisfaction of the Registrar that his trade-mark has been *bond fide* in use during three years preceding the application) the applicant is entitled to have his appeal referred to the court as a matter of course if he so desires, and it appears to us that this right should be conferred upon the applicant in all cases, and that whenever he desires his appeal to be disposed of by the court he should be entitled to go direct to the court without the circuitry and expense of going through the Board of Trade.

The *modus operandi* on an application for registration remains under the Bill substantially the same as it is at present, but we feel very strongly that under any new system one practice which prevails at the present time should be knocked on the head. At present when the Registrar has refused an application he gives notice thereof to the applicant, and it is from this refusal that the appeal is to take place. Now, the Registrar is not, according to the present practice, nor would he be under the Bill, bound to state the grounds of his refusal, although, as a matter of fact, we believe that he generally does so. On receipt of the refusal, the applicant may apply for a hearing before the Registrar, and on this hearing the Registrar may take any objection to the trade-mark. It is after this hearing the Registrar decides whether to refuse or to accept the application, and it is this decision from which, if adverse, the applicant has to appeal. According to the present practice the Registrar can, on the hearing of the appeal, take any objection that he pleases to the trade-mark, notwithstanding that no such objection may have been taken by him at the hearing or otherwise notified to the applicant. We consider that the Registrar, on refusing an application, ought to be bound to state the grounds of his refusal, and that if his decision is appealed from, no fresh ground of objection ought to be taken upon the hearing of the appeal. At the present time an applicant is often induced to appeal, believing that the only objections he has to meet are those taken by the Registrar on or prior to refusing his application, but when he comes to have his appeal heard, he is met with other objections which, perhaps, if he had been aware of at the time of appeal, would have prevented his incurring all the costs of the appeal.

The scheduled rules contain, under No. 59, a most absurd provision that, whenever an order is made by the court to rectify or vary the register, the Registrar can order the applicant to publish by advertisement or otherwise, and in such manner as he thinks fit, the terms of the order and such circumstances connected with the making of it as in the Registrar's opinion it is for the public interest should be published. It may be and probably is, right that the terms of the order should be published, but the publication should be confined to the official Trade-marks Journal, and to give the Registrar power to order the publication, not only of the order, but all such of the circumstances as he thinks fit connected with the making of the same (*i.e.*, perhaps a report of the whole or part of the proceedings in court when the order was made) and in any manner that he thinks fit (which would cover advertisement, in any number of newspapers, and also by circulars and placards), and at the expense of the applicant, appears to us to be most oppressive.

Another provision incorporated into the rules is that no words, letters, or numerals will be registered as a trade-mark in classes 23 or 24, and if they appear on a trade-mark for which registra-



tion is applied for in those classes they must be disclaimed, unless and so far as they consist in the applicant's name and address or the foreign equivalent thereof. Class 23 includes cotton yarn and sewing cotton not on spools or reels and sewing cotton on spools or reels, and class 24 is for cotton piece goods of all kinds. This rule is made in deference to the very strong feeling which exists in Manchester against words being used as trade-marks on cotton piece goods. If the rule is adopted, there will be this state of things—that all word marks which are already on the register for cotton piece goods, cotton yarn, and sewing cotton will, of course, be protected, and the owners thereof will be able to use them, but no further word marks can be registered for these goods. It seems to us that if the principle of this rule is to be adopted it should be incorporated into the body of the Act and not dealt with by rule, and it also appears to us that the matter is one which cannot properly be dealt with by rule—i.e., we doubt whether such a rule, if it had been made by the Board of Trade, would not have been *ultra vires* as not in accordance with the provisions of the Act.

The exigencies of space will only permit of our mentioning one other provision of the Bill, which is the 72nd clause. That clause is as follows: "In any proceeding under the Merchandize Marks Acts, 1887-94, in which the defendant is charged with applying a false description to goods by forging a trade-mark or by falsely applying a trade-mark to goods, and the defendant sets up a *bona fide* claim of right in respect of that which he has done, the magistrate shall not proceed with the hearing of such proceeding unless and until the proprietor of the alleged trade-mark shall by motion or other proceeding in the High Court have established, as against the defendant, that he is legally the proprietor of such trade-mark, and that the defendant has infringed the same, and that such infringement was fraudulently committed." It appears to us eminently undesirable to tamper with the Merchandize Marks Acts in the manner proposed. The Merchandize Marks Acts were intended to give a cheap and speedy remedy to a person whose trade-mark is forged, or who is injured by a false trade-mark being applied to goods. The proposal is that he is not to be at liberty, where the defendant sets up a *bona fide* claim of right to do what he has done—which, as a matter of fact, he almost invariably does—to resort to this cheap and speedy way of vindicating his rights until he has established such rights by the expensive course of proceedings in the High Court for infringement of the trade-mark, and has perhaps had to run the gauntlet of the Court of Appeal and House of Lords.

Of course we presume that it is intended that clause 72 is to be subject to the provisions of clause 41—i.e., that a trade-mark owner will have the benefit of the latter section in proceedings governed by clause 72. But this is not clear upon the Bill as it stands, and in any event it ought to be made clear.

We have not, of course, exhausted in this article our criticisms on the Bill, but we think we have stated enough to show that the Bill requires most careful consideration, and is not one that ought to be rushed through Parliament.

## A Reading of the New Statutes.

### THE COUNTY COUNCILS (BILLS IN PARLIAMENT) ACT, 1903 (3 ED. 7, c. 9).

By the Borough Funds Act, 1872 (35 & 36 Vict. c. 91), power was conferred upon municipal boroughs and other local authorities to promote and oppose Bills in Parliament, and to charge the expense on the borough fund or other public funds or rates; but no expense was to be so charged unless the promotion or opposition should have had the consent of the owners and ratepayers, to be expressed as in section 4 mentioned. By section 15 of the Local Government Act, 1888 (51 & 52 Vict. c. 41), the same power of opposing Bills was conferred upon county councils, but it was provided that no consent of owners and ratepayers should be required, and also that the section was not to empower a county council to promote any Bill in Parliament, or to incur or charge any expense in relation thereto. By the present Act this restriction is withdrawn, and it is now provided that the power conferred by the above section on a county council to oppose Bills in Parliament shall be extended so as to authorize them to promote Bills as well as to oppose them; and in either case the county council will be able to act without obtaining any consent of owners and ratepayers. The Act came into operation on the 1st inst.

### THE BOROUGH FUNDS ACT, 1903 (3 ED. 7, c. 14).

This Act imposes new requirements as a condition for the charging on public funds by a borough or urban district council of expenses of promoting Bills in Parliament, and removes the requirement of the consent of the electors to opposing Bills. The power of so charging expenses is, as stated above, given by the Borough Funds Act, 1872, and the present Act is an amendment of that statute. The requirements now introduced are contained in the first schedule to the Act, and they include the giving notice of the proposed promotion of a Bill in the specified manner, and the holding under certain regulations of a public meeting of the electors. The mayor, or chairman, or failing him, some other person appointed by the council, will preside, and will give such explanation of the Bill as he thinks expedient, and will put a resolution or a series of separate resolutions on the Bill, and, unless a poll is required in the prescribed manner, the decision of the meeting, as declared by the president, will be final. A poll may be required by not less than one hundred electors, or one-twentieth of the electors, whichever may be the less, or, if the decision of the meeting is against the resolution, by the council; and a requisition in writing, signed by the persons making it, or if by the council, authorized by resolution of the council, must be delivered within seven days after the date of the meeting, or any adjournment thereof. Section 2 of the Act provides that if the result of the poll, or the decision of the meeting when final, is against the promotion of the Bill, or part of it, the council shall forthwith take all necessary steps to withdraw the Bill or such part, but the expenses up to that time are to be allowed. Section 6 provides that the failure to comply with the requirements of the Act shall not render invalid a charge for expenses under the Borough Funds Act, 1872, or this Act, if the requirements have been substantially complied with, and the failure has not affected the result of the proceedings under the Act. Section 7 repeals the provision in section 4 of the Borough Funds Act, under which the consent of owners and ratepayers was required for charging on public funds the expense of opposing Bills in Parliament. Thus the effect is that municipal councils can oppose Bills without any reference to the electors, but in order to obtain the expense of promoting Bills they must proceed under the provisions of the present Act. The Act came into operation on the 1st inst.

### LOCAL GOVERNMENT (TRANSFER OF POWERS) ACT, 1903 (3 ED. 7, c. 15).

By section 10 of the Local Government Act, 1888 (51 & 52 Vict. c. 41) the Local Government Board is empowered to make from time to time a provisional order for transferring certain powers, duties, and liabilities of Government departments to county councils. Apparently this means that any such order is to apply to county councils generally. The present Act, however, places upon the section another meaning, and enacts that it shall be construed as authorizing the transfer by provisional order of all or any of the powers, duties, and liabilities in question to the council of a particular county or county borough, as well as to such councils generally. A provisional order is not to be made under this Act except on the application of a council; and before it is made, the Local Government Board are to give notice to all local authorities likely to be affected, and, if a majority object, the order is not to be proceeded with. For the purposes of the Act, the expression "local authorities" is to mean borough and urban and rural district councils, boards of guardians, metropolitan borough councils, and the Common Council of the City of London.

### PISTOLS ACT, 1903 (3 ED. 7, c. 18).

This Act is discussed under "Current Topics."

### RAILWAYS (ELECTRICAL POWER) ACT, 1903 (3 ED. 7, c. 30).

The full title of this Act is "An Act to facilitate the Introduction and Use of Electrical Power on Railways," and it is a mark of the advance which is now being made in the application of electricity for locomotive purposes. By section 1 the Board of Trade are empowered to make, upon the application of a railway company, orders for certain purposes, of which the chief is the authorizing a railway company to use electricity in addition to or in substitution for any other motive power, and for any other purpose. The other purposes specified are auxiliary to this, such as the construction of generating stations or other electrical works. Under section 2 the order may contain provisions for the acquisition of land for such works, but so far as the order gives compulsory powers, it is not to come into force until confirmed by Parliament. Section 3 requires that, before making an order, the Board of Trade shall be satisfied that the notices prescribed by rules to be made under the Act have been given, and shall consider objections by local authorities and other persons, and give them an opportunity of being heard; and, if they think fit, the Board of Trade may hold a local inquiry for the purpose of considering an application for an order. The Act comes into operation on the 1st of January next.

## BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES ACT, 1903 (3 ED. 7, c. 31).

This Act effects an important extension of the functions of the Board of Agriculture. That board was formed under the Board of Agriculture Act, 1889 (51 & 52 Vict. c. 30), for the purpose primarily of taking over the powers of the Land Commissioners and various powers of the Privy Council. As representing the Land Commissioners, the board administers the Tithe Commutation Acts, the Copyhold Acts, the Inclosure Acts, the Drainage and Improvement of Land Acts, the Universities and College Estates Acts, and various other statutes. From the Privy Council it has taken over the administration of the Destructive Insects Act, 1877, and the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts; and it has what may be called an original jurisdiction with regard to the muzzling and control of dogs. Its functions also extend to the collection and preparation of statistics relating to agriculture and forestry, and to the superintendence and assistance of education in these matters, and it may also aid in making inquiries, experiments, and research. Incidentally it may be noticed that it has a hand in the making of rules under the Land Transfer Act, since it nominates one out of the committee of five, with or—sometimes it would seem against—whose advice the Lord Chancellor makes rules. These various functions give the Board an extensive administrative control over matters pertaining to the land, but it has now enlarged at once its name and its scope, and will in future take over the superintendence of fisheries, both inland and at sea. By section 1 of the present Act the board is to be styled the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries, and there are transferred to it the powers and duties of the Board of Trade under the Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Acts, the Sea Fisheries Regulation Acts, and the various Acts relating to oysters. The Act came into force on the 1st inst.

## Reviews.

## The Annual Practice.

THE ANNUAL PRACTICE, 1904: BEING A COLLECTION OF THE STATUTES, ORDERS, AND RULES RELATING TO THE GENERAL PRACTICE, PROCEDURE, AND JURISDICTION OF THE SUPREME COURT. WITH NOTES, FORMS, &c. By THOMAS SNOW, M.A., Barrister-at-Law; CHARLES BURNLEY, B.A., a Master of the Supreme Court; and FRANCIS A. STRINGER, of the Central Office, Royal Courts of Justice. One Volume Edition. Sweet & Maxwell (Limited); Stevens & Sons (Limited).

The new edition of the Annual Practice appears as a fitting herald of the commencement of a fresh legal year. In general shape and arrangement there is nothing to detract from the familiarity of the work. Time was when each year gave a chance of reduction in size and simplification in matter, but any change of this kind will now have to wait for some new influx of the reformers' zeal, and meanwhile the practitioner must be content to take the annual issue well brought up to date. The Masters' Practice Notes on the Taxation of Costs are included in Vol. II., at pp. 219-235, but the editors have not there inserted any note questioning their validity. To come across a reference to *Re Ermen* (51 W. R. 475; 1903, 2 Ch. 156) he must look at the item "Originating Summons" in Appendix N, or at the notes to ord. 65, r. 27 (29), where the ample discretion of the taxing-masters to allow all proper costs is pointed out. Probably this is the practice case which has aroused most interest in the past year. Of new rules there have been those of July last, and these are now printed in their appropriate places. They include the new rule 9 of order 3 as to the indorsement of the writ in libel cases; changes in order 11 as to service out of the jurisdiction; in ord. 36, r. 11, as to giving notice of trial; and the new rule 26a of order 65, under which orders for delivery of bills of costs and taxation in non-contentious cases may be made in any division of the High Court, overruling *Re Pollard* (20 Q. B. D. 656). Some new tables, arranged by Mr. Manson, have been added to Vol. I.—viz.: an appeal table, a table shewing what judgments are final and what interlocutory, and a table of executions. Altogether the editors and the publishers spare no trouble to make the book as complete a guide as possible to the practice of the Supreme Court. The single volume edition is a convenience.

## Books Received.

The Annual Practice, 1904: Being a Collection of the Statutes, Orders, and Rules Relating to the General Practice, Procedure, and Jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, with Notes, Forms, &c. By THOMAS SNOW, M.A., Barrister-at-Law; CHARLES BURNLEY, B.A., a Master of the Supreme Court; and FRANCIS A. STRINGER, of the Central Office, Royal Courts of Justice. Sweet & Maxwell (Limited); Stevens & Sons (Limited).

## Correspondence.

## The Land Transfer Act.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—The insinuation has been made that the opposition of solicitors to this Act is "interested." But what will be said to the following? I have just had to advise a London solicitor on the title to, and to settle the conveyance of, an important property which he has recently bought for himself and for his own occupation. He has been professionally concerned in very numerous transactions within the London district of the Land Transfer Act, and has, therefore, had a very considerable experience of its practical working. The property he has just bought is very near the boundary of that district, and desired him to ascertain whether it was within it or not. He writes "Thank goodness! the property is outside the scope of the Land Transfer Act." Are solicitors thankful to escape from benefits? Oct. 21.

LINCOLN'S-INN.

## New Orders, &amp;c.

## Youthful Offenders.

THE SUMMARY JURISDICTION RULES (SEPTEMBER), 1903, DATED SEPTEMBER 14, 1903.

I.—The security which a Court of Summary Jurisdiction may, under section 2 of the Youthful Offenders Act, 1901, require a parent or guardian to give for the good behaviour of a child or young person shall be given by way of recognizance; and the forms prescribed by the Summary Jurisdiction Rules, 1886, or forms to the like effect, shall be applicable thereto with such variations as circumstances may require.

II.—The Clerk of each Court of Summary Jurisdiction shall within three days from the date of the order send by post to the Inspector of Reformatory and Industrial Schools a copy of each order made by the Court for contribution to the support and maintenance of a child under section 4 or section 6 (1) of the Youthful Offenders Act, 1901, or under sections 25 and 26 of the Reformatory Schools Act, 1866, or under section 40 of the Industrial Schools Act, 1866, or under any local Act relating to Reformatory and Industrial Schools.

III.—An order made under section 4 or section 6 of the Youthful Offenders Act, 1901, on a parent or other person legally liable to maintain a child or young person, may be served by any Constable or School Attendance Officer or Agent of His Majesty's Inspector of Reformatory Schools by delivering a copy of such order to the person on whom it is made, or by leaving the same at such person's last known place of abode with some other person for him.

IV.—The time within which an application may be made to the Court against an order made under section 4 or section 6 of the Youthful Offenders Act, 1901, on a parent or other person liable to maintain a child or young person shall be one month after service of a copy of the order.

V.—The forms in the Schedule hereto, or forms to the like effect, may be used with such variations as circumstances may require for the purposes of the Reformatory Schools Act, 1866, the Reformatory Schools Act, 1893, and the Reformatory Schools Act, 1899, and for the purposes of the Industrial Schools Act, 1866, the Industrial Schools Act Amendment Act, 1880, the Industrial Schools Act, 1891, the Elementary Education Act, 1876, and the Youthful Offenders Act, 1901.

These Rules may be cited as the Summary Jurisdiction Rules (September) 1903; and are in substitution for the Rules made and declared urgent on the 4th January, 1902, and Gazetted on the 7th January following, which latter Rules are hereby annulled.

Dated the 14th day of September, 1903.

HALSBURY, C.

[There is a long schedule appended of forms of summonses, orders, informations, warrants, commitments, and convictions.]

Mr. Joseph Shaw, one of the Rochester City magistrates, who died this week, formerly, says the *St. James's Gazette*, served as a constable in the Metropolitan police force, and also as a private in the Royal Marines. He was accustomed to sit on the bench with his old commanding officer. Mr. Shaw was made a magistrate during the last Liberal Administration, when many working men in various parts of the kingdom were added to the commissioners of the peace.

The legal profession of Melbourne has, says the *Jewish World*, lost one of its best known members in Mr. David Braham, whose death occurred unexpectedly at his residence, Malvern, Melbourne. His death was referred to in the Insolvency Court by Judge Molesworth. Mr. Braham, Judge Molesworth said, was a widely-known and highly-respected member of the legal profession. It was nearly forty years since Mr. Braham began practice. He had been a specialist in commercial and insolvency law, and for seventeen years was the leading counsel in that court.



## Law Societies.

### The Liverpool Meeting of the Law Society.

We give below a summary of the papers which were not read at the meeting owing to lack of time.

#### THE PROFESSION AND PUBLIC OPINION.

A paper on this subject was read by Mr. R. G. LAWSON.

Mr. Lawson gave, by interesting extracts from the works of contemporary writers, representative opinions upon the profession during the last 500 years, and continued: Notwithstanding the reforms which have undoubtedly been made in the law, the opinion seems as condemnatory to-day as centuries ago. If the opinions I have cited represent the plain, unvarnished truth, or substantially the truth, then it is time there was a revolution! I do not suggest that a cry should be raised as Shakespeare's character does: "Let's kill all the lawyers," though I have heard the opinion gravely expressed by a member of the profession that a plague or war would be an unmixed blessing. But, of course, these opinions are mainly based on ignorance and prejudice. This suggestion, however, of "killing all the lawyers" is not quite so idle as it might at first appear, because it will be remembered that so late as 1780 (in the Gordon Riots) the attempt was made to sweep them away. "Death to thieves" was the cry of the mob as they ransacked and destroyed the house of Lord Mansfield. ("A Book about Lawyers," by John Cordy Jeaffreson, pp. 101 to 103.) . . . It may confidently be averred that the common practice of impugning the integrity of the profession can easily be demonstrated to be without justification. There is no other body to whose care and custody the fortunes of others, their wives, widows, and children are so frequently committed, and it follows therefore that they, more than the generality of men, are subject to great and special temptations which the vast majority of men pass from the cradle to the grave without experiencing. Solicitors are very properly required to maintain the highest standard of integrity. "Solicitors," said Lord Esher, "are not merely bound to act with faith and honour, but with a scrupulous nicety of conduct which may not even appear to shew the least breach of faith and honour." If a solicitor falls from this high standard he is liable to be struck off the rolls or suspended from practice, which in either case involves his ruin. There is no other profession whose members are subjected to the keenest of all known human scrutiny—that of the judges of England. The percentage of lapses from this high standard is relatively small. During the last five years the following have been the number of members struck off the rolls or suspended:—

	Struck off.	Suspended.
1897-1898	16	1
1898-1899	11	1
1899-1900	15	0
1900-1901	21	3
1901-1902	26	3
1902-1903	17	9

According to the Board of Trade Report of 1902 the following are the returns from 1897 to 1901 of the failures of solicitors under Bankruptcy and Deeds of Arrangement Acts:—

Year	No.	Liabilities.
1897	50	£463,094
1898	38	£166,820
1899	30	£627,489
1900	32	£470,200
1901	65	£291,860

The last year shewing a decrease in total liabilities of £178,340. It must be acknowledged that during the last few years there have been too many cases of daring and disgraceful robberies by solicitors—of trusts broken, and great names tarnished. Silence on the subject has been mistaken by the public. The public always appreciate frankness. Time after time has the question been asked why no reference to these cases has been made at the annual meetings. The public think there has been a conspiracy of silence. The public in the long run is just, and while they will not condemn a whose body of honourable practitioners for the offences of a few, they will and do expect us to speak out boldly, fearlessly and without restraint—to keep these deplorable cases in our minds as warnings—to shew publicly that we appreciate their gravity and not only to concur in any measures for the prevention of their recurrence, but to display our eagerness to do so. . . . One of the strongest prejudices against solicitors arises from the expenses of litigation; yet everyone here knows it to be a fact that the largest proportion of every solicitor's bill consists of sums he has paid on behalf of his client for counsel, witnesses, and charges of the court itself. Sir Francis Jeune has lately said: "But, do what anyone may, law will never be cheap. It involves too much exercise of highly trained ability and experience—to say nothing of integrity—for that." The cost of a simple assize action where a junior counsel is employed is now trifling, and there is very little profit to the solicitors. The heavy item in conveyancing is the Stamp Duty, which presses unduly upon the investors in real estate. The profession is blamed for the inevitable incidents of judicial administration, common to all countries—the cost, delay, and failure to administer ideal justice. At the meeting of the Solicitors' Benevolent Association, in 1899, Mr. J. E. Gray Hill expressed his belief that the average income of the solicitor would not amount to £200 a year; and at the meeting in 1900 Mr. Henry Attlee, the chairman, said: "To-day there were at least 15,000 practising solicitors whose names appeared in the Law List. He had made

inquiries some years ago as to the average income of solicitors on the rolls, and had been astonished to find that it could not be put higher than £300 a year—in fact, a much lower sum would probably represent that income. It seemed to him to be altogether an inadequate income for men who had passed at least five years of their lives without earning anything, and who, in addition, had had to pay very heavy fees before they could enter the profession. But if this truthfully represented the average income of solicitors, what a large number of members of the profession there must be who could not make any provision for those who were dependent upon them." It cannot, therefore, now be said that solicitors grow rich at the expense of their clients. As an indication of the state of the profession it is the fact, I believe, that seven barristers and solicitors are inmates of workhouses, and seventy-three of lunatic asylums, and the reports of the Solicitors' Benevolent Association are indeed melancholy reading. The lawyers have been, and still are, the leading law reformers. It was Lord Romilly who reformed the criminal law, which was then a disgrace to a civilized country. It was Lord Brougham who gave new life to the County Courts. It was the late Lord Selborne who simplified the practice of the High Courts by the abolition of special pleading and the fusion of law and equity. It was Lord Cairns who introduced the Conveyancing Act, 1881, by which a conveyance was reduced from an interminable length to such an extent that it can now be written on half a sheet of note-paper. It was Mr. Asquith who first introduced a Bill on the lines of the present Workmen's Compensation Act. The profession opposed, and still opposes, the Land Transfer Act—because having a special knowledge of the subject, and the members know that it will substitute a costly and slow official machinery for a less costly one. Can we point to any official department—except the Post Office—which is conducted with despatch and economy? How long, for instance, does it take to get a reply, beyond acknowledgment, from Somerset House to any question arising under the Finance Act? Experience shews that delay and expense are inseparable from any official system. One of the pressing dangers of the profession arises from the excessive number of its members, rendering it so difficult for many to earn a bare living, and therefore leading them to engage in financial and speculative enterprises quite outside the proper sphere of their duties. For the year ending the 31st of March, 1883, 10,200 solicitors' certificates were issued in England and Wales; in 1883, 10,350; in 1873, 10,973; in 1883, 13,066; in 1893, 15,175; and in 1903, 16,265 were issued. The candidates for the final examination in the year 1901 were 864 (Law Notes, January, 1902), and in 1902, 861 (Law Notes, January, 1903). At the final examination held in June, 1903, there were 342 candidates, as against 302 in 1901 and 306 in 1902. If the multiplication of the profession is likely to go on in years to come at the rate at which it has been proceeding in the last fifty years some drastic remedy will, I think, have to be applied. In some countries the state limits the number of lawyers. . . . With a view to the limitation of the number of the profession and the elevation of the standard, a bachelor's degree might be made compulsory. A Bachelor of Arts degree is now taken by the great majority of the bar, and we ought to aim at equally as high a standard of education. At the final examination, held in June last, out of 218 successful candidates, forty-six held either a B.A. or LL.B. degree. The preliminary law examination is regarded as much too easy. I have heard it suggested that a moderate reform might be effected by solicitors retiring from practice earlier than is the custom.

#### DEFECTS IN THE LAWS RELATING TO MARRIED WOMEN.

A paper on this subject was read by Mr. JOHN INDERMAUR (LONDON).

After preliminary observations, Mr. Indermaur stated as follows the anomalies or defects of the law:

(1) A husband is still liable for his wife's torts: *Serks v. Kattenberg* (17 Q. B. D. 177), *Earle v. Kingcoote* (1900, 2 Ch. 585). This was right enough in the old common law. The husband had full control over his wife, but now he has no legal control: *Ray v. Jackson* (1891, 1 Q. B. C. A. 671). The husband took practically all his wife's property. As she was thus denuded of everything it was only right that her husband should be responsible for her actions. But we have changed all that—he does not take her property. Why in the name of reason then should a man be now still liable to pay damages because his wife libels someone, or commits some other tort? Yet such is the case. It is true the husband cannot be sued alone, but the wife must be joined; but judgment being obtained against them, execution may be levied against the husband for the whole amount. There was logic and reason in the old common law, put it in whichever way you will, but there is nothing of the kind in the present state of things. The reason for matters being as they are is, however, perfectly simple. There was the common law, and the framers of the Married Women's Property Act, 1882, forgot all about this point. (2) A married woman is under no personal liability for her debts: *Serfs v. Marley* (20 Q. B. D. 120). This was right enough at common law, she not having a distinct existence apart from her husband. Equity created separate estate, and then proceeded to hold that separate estate should be liable for the married woman's debts. The Court of Chancery could not hold that she herself was liable for her debts, for equity followed the law, and never held that she was a distinct being apart from her husband, but only that property might be held by a trustee for her separate use. The most the court could hold was that her separate estate was liable for her debts. But why was this not all changed by the Act of 1882? I am sure I do not know, but it was not. Perhaps the point was not thought of, or at any rate properly appreciated by the framers. Whatever was the reason is now of no importance; the fact remains that though a married woman has a separate individuality, yet she is a peculiarly protected being, for she is under no personal liability whatever. If you can get hold of her separate estate, well and good; if not, you can do nothing. Thus, she may have plenty of money, but no order

can be made to commit her to prison under the Debtors Act, 1869, as having means to pay. This seems sheer nonsense, and means an incomplete alteration of the rule of common law, and the doctrine of equity. But the absurdity of the matter does not rest here. The Act of 1882 having made her separate estate liable, there then came the case of *Paillier v. Gurney* (19 Q. B. D. 519), which decided that to render a married woman's future acquired separate estate liable she must have been possessed of some separate estate at the time of contracting the debt. This defect was remedied by the Married Women's Property Act, 1893, s. 1, but not altogether satisfactorily, for the Act goes on to provide that this shall not render available to satisfy any obligation arising out of any contract made during marriage, any separate property which at that time or thereafter she was restrained from anticipating; and on this enactment it was decided in *Barnett v. Howard* (1900, 2 Q. B. 784) that if a married woman is restrained from anticipating a life income at the date when she made a contract, or at any subsequent date during the marriage, income which accrues therefrom after she becomes discoverable cannot be taken in execution to satisfy her liability on that contract. (3) She cannot ordinarily be made a bankrupt.—Of course, one can well understand that, as matters originally stood, a married woman could not be made a bankrupt. This seems natural and reasonable, and in accordance with the principles of the common law. But why, when the Act of 1882 established her in an independent position, it should carefully be enacted that she can only be made a bankrupt when carrying on a trade or business apart from her husband, and then only to the extent of her separate property, I cannot perceive. We know the old bankruptcy laws were specially invented for traders; but not so the modern ones, for traders and non-traders alike may be made bankrupt now. Then why only a trading married woman? And why hem in the position even then by enacting that she can only be made bankrupt in respect of her separate property, and give rise to such a decision as in *Re Armstrong, Ex parte Gilchrist* (17 Q. B. D. 521), to the effect that as a power of appointment is not, strictly speaking, property, she cannot, though bankrupt, be made to exercise it in favour of her creditors? To further emphasize the absurdities on the point I am now dealing with, I would remark that as the judgment signed against a married woman is not a personal judgment, but only a judgment against her separate estate, even if she is trading apart from her husband, and capable, therefore, of being made a bankrupt, she cannot be compelled to commit an act of bankruptcy by the service of a bankruptcy notice: *Re Lynes* (1893, 2 Q. B. 113). (4) She is specially protected by the anticipation clause.—This clause was invented in somewhat ancient times by the Court of Chancery as a sort of addendum to the idea of separate property. It was said that a man might kiss or kick his wife out of her separate property, and therefore it was necessary she should be further protected. Well, I daresay it was at that time, and the clause formed a very valuable further protection to the married woman. The necessity for such a clause may be somewhat doubted at the present day, when a married woman occupies a very different position to what she did. The state of things has changed, and I cannot but think that the clause does more injustice than good, and this has, to a certain extent, been recognized by the Conveyancing Act, 1881, s. 39. . . . . (5) If she is an active trustee of realty she cannot convey the property as a *feme sole*.—This is a ludicrous absurdity, and it is a pity such a decision, logical though it may be, has been arrived at. That it is strictly logical I do not deny, though I think a more liberal interpretation of the Married Women's Property Act, 1882, might well have been come to. A married woman entitled to realty could only convey by deed together with her husband, she being separately examined and acknowledging the deed. The Married Women's Property Act, 1882, provides that she may hold property, and convey, as a *feme sole*. The Act was, no doubt, aimed at her ownership of her beneficial property, and the fact of her possibly being a trustee was not thought of. Such a case was not, I admit, within the scope and general notion of the Act. Therefore in *Re Harkness and Allopp's Contract* (1896, 2 Ch. 358) it was held that the Act did not touch the point of a married woman who was an active trustee of real estate, and that for her to convey, the same course must be adopted as before the Act. The result, therefore, is that whilst with regard a married woman's own real property she holds it, and can convey it, as a *feme sole*, if it is held on some active trust her husband must join. If this is not an absurd defect in the law I do not know what is. I appoint a spinster a trustee, she marries, and lo! I find her husband mixed up in the trust. The matter is rendered all the more absurd by the fact that if a married woman is only a bare trustee she may convey by herself, this having been provided for by the Vendor and Purchaser Act, 1874. (6) She is still for some purposes considered as one with her husband.—If an estate were given to A. and B. and their heirs, and they were husband and wife, they were said to take by entirety; that is, unlike ordinary joint tenants, neither could deal with property without the consent of the other, but they must both join in making a disposition, or run the risk of losing or gaining the whole by survivorship. This has naturally been altered by the Act of 1882, and now they are ordinary joint tenants: *Re March, Mander v. Harris* (27 Ch. D. 166). But suppose an estate is given to A., B., and C. and their heirs, and A. and B. happen to be husband and wife, it has been held that A. and B. are still, though not taking by entirety but as joint tenants, to be considered as one person as regards C., so that A. and B. are joint tenants of one half and C. takes the other half: *Re Jupp* (39 Ch. D. 148). This seems to me illogical and nonsensical. The wife being established as a separate being, she ought to be so for all purposes, but yet here she is considered to a certain extent as one with her husband. (7) Her rights in her husband's realty on his death are not the same as his rights in her realty.—I refer here to the difference between dower and curtesy. Both are now comparatively of little importance, but why should there be any difference at all? If on the death of the wife intestate a

husband is to get a life estate in the entirety of her realty if he has had issue by her capable of inheriting, why should she only be entitled to a life interest in one-third of his realty? Again, why should the husband only have curtesy if he has had issue by his wife born alive capable of inheriting, and yet the wife have dower quite irrespective of that circumstance? To my mind it is anomalous at the present day that there should be any distinction whatever between the parties' respective rights. (8) Her rights in her husband's personality on his death are not the same as his rights in her personality.—I can well understand the law in olden times giving the husband the whole of his wife's personality on her death, and only giving the wife a portion of his, but I do not understand why this state of things should be perpetuated at the present day. It seems to me that here the wife is very unfairly treated, and that the position is unfair, to a certain extent, recognized by the Intestates Act, 1890. That statute has improved the wife's position a little, but not much, for it must be remembered that it only applies where a man dies leaving a wife and no child, and even then it does not do her justice. A married woman dies intestate, and her husband gets all her personality. A married man dies intestate, and his wife gets only a portion of his personality. Say a married man dies leaving a wife and a child: the latter gets two-thirds and the former one-third. Surely this is absurd. A married man dies intestate leaving surviving him a wife and a cousin, and leaving £10,000; the wife gets £500 and half of £9,500, that is £4,750, total £5,250; whilst the cousin gets £4,750. It seems to me the wife ought to take the whole. I think the woman is treated very unjustly, and the absurdity seems palpable. What reason can at the present day exist for making their positions different? It would not be a difficult task to draw a short Act of Parliament which would quickly cure the defects I have pointed out. The subject is one which has long occurred to me as requiring attention, and I have often wondered why it has not received it. With all humility I venture to hope that this paper may be the means of drawing the attention of some of our legislators to the matter, and affording them an opportunity of being the authors of some useful legislation.

#### A PROPOSAL FOR OPENING A NEW ROLL OF SOLICITORS, PAST AND PRESENT (?), OF PROFESSIONAL AND OTHER DISTINCTION.

A paper on this subject was read by Mr. ALBERT FORBES SIEVEKING, F.S.A.

After some preliminary observations, Mr. Sieveking stated his proposals as follows: (1) In the first instance I would collect from our own archives and all other available sources—such, for instance, as the *Gentleman's Magazine*, the various law publications, the "Dictionary of National Biography" (that modern annexe to Westminster Abbey), "Modern English Biographies" (by our own excellent librarian, Mr. Frederick Boase), and from existing oral evidence—the names and short biographies of all solicitors who, through being thus commemorated, have been regarded by their contemporaries as men of light and leading in some sense or other. (2) I would suggest that a census be taken periodically, or a register kept, of all members of our profession who have attained the honour of baronetries and knighthood, membership of either Houses of Parliament, or who have filled any kind of public office, such as justice of the peace, mayor, official solicitor, solicitor to the Treasury, &c., clerks to magistrates, county councils, municipal bodies, coronerships, offices of or about the Law Courts (such as masters, registrars, chief clerks, taxing-masters, &c.), solicitors or clerks to city companies, insurance offices, and public offices; the lists of all firms whose names are recorded in important cases in the official Law Reports; and of all past presidents, members of the Council, and secretaries of our society. (Our librarian has already to some extent fulfilled this task in his work already alluded to.) (3) Upon every new member joining this society I would suggest that he should receive, to fill up (entirely at his own option) for registration in the office of the society, a form with spaces for particulars of his places of education and any other short biographical details he would care to give (as if, say, he were writing the personal notice for that very useful and accurate publication "Who's Who"—possibly excluding his recreations). (4) I would set apart a special clerk at the institution for this purpose, and the more literary part of the work might, perhaps, be offered to the charge of our librarian, who has shown himself admirably qualified to undertake it.

#### TRUSTEE COMPANIES.

Mr. NESBITT read a paper on this subject.

The main object of the paper was to give an account of the methods by which executors and trustee business is transacted in the Australian Commonwealth and in New Zealand, and the paper stated very fully the way in which executorship and trusteeship business is largely conducted in the Australian Colonies. The particulars furnished by four of the trustee companies, he said, showed that the total value of the estates under their control are as follows:—

Trustees, Executors, and Agency Co., Melbourne.		
June 30, 1901	.....	£6,569,542
June 30, 1902	.....	£6,646,727
Perpetual Trustee Co., New South Wales.		
December 31, 1900	.....	£3,928,520
December 31, 1901	.....	£4,501,515
Permanent Trustee Co., New South Wales, Ltd.		
September 30, 1901	.....	£1,565,336
September 30, 1902	.....	£1,552,419
Executor, Trustee, and Agency Co., of South Australia.		
September 30, 1901	.....	£1,006,574
September 30, 1902	.....	£1,211,637

And if we estimate the business done by the other companies on the



4, 1903.

if he has had  
entitled to a  
the husband  
ve capable of  
that circum-  
there should  
ights. (8) He  
e same as his  
a older times  
er death, and  
and why this  
seems to me  
tion is unfair  
That statute  
or it must be  
wife and no  
woman died  
ed man dies  
Say a married  
birds and the  
dies intestate  
00; the wife  
; whilst the  
the whole. I  
ardity seems  
making their  
short Act of  
out. The  
tion, and I  
humility I  
g the atten-  
them as

PAST AND  
ON.

SIEVEKING,

is proposals  
own archives  
Gentlemen of  
of National  
"Modern  
Frederick  
biographies  
have been  
ing in some  
odically, or  
ained the  
Houses of  
s justice of  
clerks to  
ices of  
s, taxing-  
offices, and  
important  
members of  
already to  
(3) Upon  
he should  
the office of  
education  
(as if, say,  
arate pub-  
(4) I would  
t the more  
ge of our  
ke it.

at of the  
ted in the  
per stated  
business is  
furnished  
l value of

542  
727

520  
515

536  
419

ia.  
574  
537

g on the

particulars which I have, it may be taken that estates amounting to between £21,000,000 and £22,000,000 are now under administration by companies throughout Australia. After details as to the Public Trust Office, Mr. Nesbitt continued: Having given a brief narrative of the manner in which trust business is largely conducted in Australia and New Zealand, the question arises, What are the advantages that are claimed for the systems? Some advantages which are claimed are common to all. The advantages of a company over private trustees are well summarised by Mr. Blundell, the manager of the Queensland Trustees, Ltd., and are applicable as well to the Public Trustee in New Zealand as to the Australian companies. They may be stated to be that, whereas a testator or settlor is under an obligation to friends who undertake the performance of a trust, a trustee company's business is the performance of trusts. While an individual trustee may move to another part of the world, and be most difficult of access, a company is always on the spot ready to transact its business; while an individual trustee through ignorance may commit a breach of trust which results in loss to himself or to his *cestui que trustent* a trustee company employs trained officers who understand how trusts should be performed, so that breaches of trust are not likely to be committed through ignorance, and if a properly constituted company make a mistake it has guarantee and reserve funds out of which to make good the money lost; a sole trustee may speculate with the trust property either to benefit himself or the trust, the fund may be lost, the trustee become bankrupt and the beneficiaries left destitute, whereas a trustee company has no interest in speculating; its very existence depends on the performance of its trusts in accordance with the powers given it, and it has no other business or interest to benefit by speculation. Often beneficiaries have difficulty in obtaining particulars of the trust estate or accounts from individual trustees, while a trustee company has no other business to attend to except the affairs of the several trusts, and the position of all estates in its care can be ascertained at any moment; and lastly, while individual trustees die, and have to be replaced at some expense on each appointment by others often unacquainted with the past history of the trust or family, a properly constituted trustee company never dies, and there is no expense of appointing new trustees. On the other hand, one of the views against the establishment of trustee companies or a public trustee was put in evidence before a Select Committee of the Legislative Assembly in Victoria in 1879 while the Bill for the first Australian company was under consideration, and I will quote the statement of the witness: "A private individual knows the estate before he takes it. The company knows nothing of the estate; all it knows is that A. B. dies, say, up at the Grampians. They know nothing of the estate till it comes to them. A man names a friend as a trustee, and, another thing, the private executor or trustee is acquainted with the man's family, knows his affairs to a certain extent, and he is in the position before he accepts the trust to see whether there is any likelihood of conflicting interests arising. The company cannot possibly know anything about it; they are all strangers. That is one of the great distinctions between a private individual and this company, and, as Mr. Blake said, this company does away with the personal supervision and interest which the private executor takes in the will. Then, again, I cannot conceive the manager of this company, however worthy he is—and I have not the slightest objection to the present board, but we do not know how it may be composed this day ten years—with an immense mass of estates he may have in his hands, capable of entering into the feelings of, and otherwise acting in concert with, the family. There are many things of a personal knowledge that would be attended to by a private trustee that a company cannot know. A young woman is going to be married, say; there is the arrangement of the marriage settlement, the inquiring into the means and eligibility of the suitor, and hundreds of other things." No doubt very much depends on the particular manager of the company; indeed, I find in Australia that while the safety of the trust funds is jealously guarded by the directors themselves all the personal dealings between the beneficiaries and the company are conducted by the manager, and that naturally it is the manager who is in touch with the parties and practically has to decide those many matters of a personal character that arise in the management of family trusts. . . . With regard to the Judicial Trustees Act, 1896, which was passed as a result of the report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons in 1895, and which is very much based on the system of administering private trusts in Scotland, as explained by Lord MacLaren, I think I am not exaggerating the position when I say that to all practical intents and purposes that Act is a dead letter so far as its main provisions relating to the appointment of judicial trustees are concerned. I believe I am correct in saying that during the six years the Act has been in force there have been only some thirty cases in which judicial trustees have been appointed, so that no real use has been made of its provisions. . . . The idea of a corporation acting as executor or trustee does not appear to meet with any feeling of favour in this country, in spite of the evident success its adoption has met with elsewhere. The "business of an executor and trustee" is an idea that people are very slow in getting used to. I suppose it is because this is an old country with old families with rooted ideas and a feeling of liking for old methods of managing their affairs, and the Colonies are young and more easily adapt themselves to new ideas and ways of doing things. For, whereas the Torrens system of transfer of land works perfectly in Australia, here, in spite of the many obvious advantages which a proper system of land registration has, the idea has never been successful, and though the Transfer of Land Act, 1897, has introduced the principle of compulsion, most people think the land registry now as far from being successful as ever it was. And so it seems with the system of private trusteeships. I must not be taken as advocating in England the establishment of a public trustee, as in New

Zealand, with all the official machinery which in this country it would involve, although a Bill to this end once passed in the House of Lords; but it seems to me that the formation of trustee companies under private Acts of Parliament similar to those existing in Australia, and having for their sole object the transaction of the business of trustees and executors, might go a long way to solve for many people, particularly the poorer and more helpless classes of the community, the undoubted difficulties which testators and settlors have to meet with in finding suitable persons to carry out their wishes, and, what is perhaps equally important, to relieve private individuals from the arduous labours, always unremunerated and often attended with loss, which they incur in undertaking the office of trustee. At any rate, this paper is intended to offer some food for reflection, and to give some information obtained at first hand upon a very important subject as dealt with by our kinsmen across the seas, who have thought the matter out for themselves and put their ideas into practice, ideas which have now satisfactorily stood the test of many years in those communities where they have been tried.

#### SUGGESTIONS FOR THE EFFICIENT AND ECONOMICAL CONDUCT OF A SOLICITOR'S OFFICE.

Mr. COOKE read a paper on this subject:—

"Order is Heaven's first law," and as such this precept should be well observed in a solicitor's office. Disorder involves loss of time, money, and temper, and with the latter the loss of suitable words in which adequately to express our ideas. If, therefore, my short paper can in some small degree save all the above, or if it should occasion valuable suggestions from others, I shall feel more than amply repaid for my trouble in introducing the subject. For the purpose of my paper I sent a series of questions to leading firms in some twenty or thirty different cities and towns in the Kingdom, and I now beg to thank my correspondents personally for their courteous replies. I also read and studied a small work recently published by Stevens & Sons (Limited) entitled, "The Modern Lawyer's Office," written by a solicitor, who makes some valuable suggestions, and fully explains the system used by lawyers in the United States of America. The first lesson we have to learn is not to be too conservative in our notions, and if in the past we have adopted certain rules as to the conduct of our offices, we, like business men, should inquire whether we can effect any improvements which are a saving both of time and money; indeed, one cause of my writing this paper is to inform others of a new method of keeping the day books and the entries of professional charges which I was kindly shown by a London firm. From the answers I have received from others, I am quite sure that this method is not generally known, although it practically allows the office boy to do what has hitherto been carried out by a special clerk at a high salary. It is the practice of many solicitors, especially in the country, to keep a day book in which entries are made of all attendances and correspondence. These entries are very often minutely and correctly copied into a bill of costs ledger, in which for the first time the consecutive entries are made against each particular client. Then sometimes from this a draft bill is prepared which again has to be copied for the client, and occasionally a press copy is made of the fair copy bill. Under this system five copies are made of each entry; if we can reduce those five entries to two, we shall save an enormous amount of valuable time and unnecessary trouble and expense. The new system dealing with the above work certainly only does require two entries, and I venture to submit it is equally efficient. May I now explain it? First, the entries are dictated to a shorthand clerk, who is present when the morning correspondence is received, and the replies taken down by another shorthand-clerk, who is all the better if he is also an expert typewriter. The clerk who has taken down the entries proceeds to write them down in a book called "The Entry Book." The peculiarity of this entry book is that it has a gummed back, with perforations down the inside of the page, so that it can readily be torn out. When a sheet of the entry book is full, it is detached from the book, handed to the office boy, who proceeds with a pair of scissors to cut out the entries against each client, and by means of the gummed back and a wet brush to post or fasten them against each particular client in another book, called "The Guard Book," which corresponds to the old draft bill of costs book. In this way the terrible process of what used to be called "posting the ledger" is absolutely done away with, and a solicitor knows from day to day that in a very few minutes the client's account can be settled by himself or his bill of costs clerk right up to date. The entry book is ruled with money columns which can be filled in with the costs to be charged; the bill can be copied direct from the guard book, and there is no necessity for any further copy. These entry and guard books can be printed and prepared by your printer, and the price should not exceed £1 4s. per dozen for the entry books of 100 pages each, and £4 17s. 6d. per dozen for the guard books of 300 pages each. I have specimens of these books with me, and shall be happy to produce and explain them more fully than this paper permits. In many offices I found that the bill of costs is made out from day to day on separate sheets against each client; this is much better than the old system, but the objection to that mode seems to be that the sheets are apt to be misplaced or lost, whereas with the guard book system such a loss is not likely to occur. Some critics may suggest the total abolition of the day or entry book, making the entry direct and at once against the client; the objection to such a proposal is obvious where several clerks may be attending to parts of the same business matter, such as is involved where one draws the document and another copies. The advantage of the entry book is that each clerk may have his own book for his own

work; his entry is cut out and, according to date, pasted in the guard book against the particular client who is to be debited. I now turn to the important question of filing and keeping letters received. Many solicitors in former years used to file these in bundles in order of date, so that if you wanted to find a particular letter you had first to hunt for the date on which it was received; only a clerk who had been in the office some time had an idea of the date; a new clerk might be half an hour in discovering it. Many solicitors, I find, now put all the correspondence with the papers, but this system leaves miscellaneous letters, or letters connected with which there are no papers, to be placed separately. I should like to hear the views of those who have had experience of this system, particularly as to what becomes of correspondence connected with, or relating to, say, a simple conveyance or mortgage: are such letters filed with the drafts? To my mind, it is much better to keep drafts by themselves, where they can readily be found, and these should be indexed alphabetically in a register, stating in which numerical bundle it has been placed. If that system is adopted, then very often there are no papers with which to file the letters referred to. Another system is to have an alphabetical wallet or portfolio, in which the letters are placed alphabetically from day to day in order of date as received, then, when the portfolio is full, place them in a transfer case in the same order, indexing on the outside of the transfer case the month which those letters represent. For instance, you want a letter from Jones: you know probably to a month when it was received; you look under the letter J for that or the succeeding month, and you at once find all the letters Jones has written. So that my information may be complete, I may add that the best and cheapest portfolios and transfer cases, complete with alphabetical index, can, in my opinion, be obtained from Mr. John Miller, 116, Renfield Street, Glasgow, at the following low prices: portfolios 7s. 6d. per dozen, transfer portfolios with indices 15s. per dozen. The system adopted for dealing with letters despatched seems to vary: some copy in an ordinary letter-press copying book, others have a typed carbon copy made and placed with papers, some type the second copy direct into the letter book by means of a new American typewriting machine, others have a loose interleaved sheet in the letter copying book so that two copies are made at the same time, one in the letter book and one loose copy to file with the papers. Members can best study and decide what suits their practice in this particular. The above points do not, of course, touch the question of money received and paid: cash ledgers dealing only with cash or debits and credits should certainly be in use in every solicitor's office. A solicitor ought to be able to know from day to day what he has in hand on behalf of each particular client, as also what each client owes him. Too often this is not so. Whatever system is used, the accounts ought to be subject to annual audit by some independent auditor residing away from the town where the practice is carried on. Printed receipts ought to be given for moneys received, and the details of the receipt ought to be correctly entered on the counterfoil of the receipt-book. I now come to a very important question—namely, the keeping of clients' money separate and distinct from other moneys. Of course, if it is an account likely to extend over a considerable length of time, the money should be placed at the bank to the credit of that particular client. Generally speaking, it is sufficient to have an account called "clients' account" as distinguished from the "office account" and "private account." Some solicitors call their clients' account "No. 2 account." I prefer the former term, because, to a certain extent, it ear-marks the money. A solicitor should try to make his bankers keep some check upon his accounts and help to know exactly where he is financially. I therefore suggest a solicitor should have three accounts with his bankers: (1) Clients' account; (2) office account; (3) private account. If the solicitor receives, say, a deposit of £100 on a sale, he pays that sum into clients' account, using to pay outstanding accounts connected with the sale, such as auctioneers', printing, and advertisement charges. Then, on completion, he transfers out of the above sum to office account sufficient to cover the costs of sale, and the balance he pays to his client. All expenses of carrying on the office are paid out of office account, to which account all bills received are paid. At the end of each quarter, or oftener, you can look at your office account, and whatever excess of credits over debits there be you know is actual profit received, therefore you transfer such excess, or such part as you think proper, to private account. Under this system you never feel the slightest temptation to touch your clients' money improperly, you make your bankers keep your actual profit and loss account so far as relates to money actually received, and by looking at your private account to see what has been transferred, you ascertain, without your own books, what amount of profit you have actually received from your practice. Young solicitors should begin this system at once, however small their business may be. Too often they are tempted to pay in clients' money to their own account so that bankers may see they have a large sum standing to their credit. The day, however, comes when the solicitor has not only mixed his moneys but also his accounts, and does not know how much money lying at his bankers' is his own and how much his clients'. Extravagance follows, and this may precede a downfall which brings disgrace. It is not my intention to deal with minor points, such as the necessity for keeping a deed receipt-book, a register of deeds left by clients, a call-book, and a postage-book. These are to be found in every well-conducted office. Nor have I time to explain the numerical or card system in vogue in America. This is best dealt with in the work I have before referred to. Although I have attempted to give information, my desire is to obtain more from others. Discussion of the various systems in vogue for conducting the office work of a solicitor will lead to improvements on the part of many, perhaps of all.

## ESTATE DUTY.

Mr. THATCHER read a paper on this subject, in which, after tracing the origin and growth of probate and estate duties, and considering estate duty under the heads of: (1) What is liable to estate duty? (2) the rate of duty payable; (3) the time of payment; (4) who is liable to pay; (5) settlement estate duty, he said:—

The amendments I would propose to the present law are four, and I venture to invite a recommendation to the Council in respect of each one. The first is that there should be one uniform rule for all estates irrespective of the date of death; this would greatly simplify matters, and save trouble to all concerned. It is true, taking things generally, the law and duties as they stand for deaths occurring now press more hardly than formerly, yet if estates suffered it would in most cases be the fault of those responsible for not having presented their accounts earlier. Aggregation should be abolished, and each succession should be assessed separately at its appropriate percentage of duty. Estate duty should not be a charge so as to affect purchasers or mortgagees, but should be on the same footing as legacy duty is at present. In most cases real estate (in which I include leaseholds for present purposes) is brought in in Accounts A or D to the affidavit, as the case may be; this affidavit is filed, and the accounts with it. It is true these particular accounts, so far as regards real estate, could be brought in separately on a C form, which it passed in duplicate, and is a record of the payment of the duty and the property affected; or a certificate of payment of duty can be obtained, but both these courses mean extra trouble and consequent expense. It should be remembered that leaseholds were liable to probate duty, but such duty was payable out of general assets, and was not a charge. Estate duty should not be a charge, but a preferential debt, and the present liabilities of accounting parties should be considered a sufficient protection. My last point is that payment of estate duty on personal estate should be on the same footing as on real estate—that is, either at the time of rendering the account or six months after the death, whichever first happens, and not necessarily antecedent, as at present, to grants of probate and administration. It is frequently matter of great hardship for applicants to find the money for the duty before being allowed to touch the assets. Take the following case, which is by no means an uncommon one: A professional man died, leaving policies on his life which amounted to about £10,000; brewery shares, £500; furniture, about £700 or £800; money in the bank, £80; money in the house, about £10; book debts and other odds and ends. His family were dependent on him; the daily household expenses, rent, and other liabilities were all going on, and not an asset could be realised until nearly £300 was found and paid for estate duty. The family must find someone to advance the duty, and even if they succeed in doing this without much trouble, they place themselves under an obligation which they should not be asked to do. Generally it is the solicitor who has to find the money in cases of this sort, and this is not always easy or convenient. I am quite aware that the Commissioners have power under section 8, sub-section 9, of the Act of 1894 to postpone payment of duty where they are satisfied that the duty in respect of any property cannot without excessive sacrifice be raised at once; but, speaking from personal experience, and information furnished from a high authority, I have not found this power exercised in every-day cases, such as the instance I have given. The practice might be varied by the affidavit and accounts being carried in as at present, and the estate duty being subsequently paid on an account similar to the present residuary account. Interest on the duty at a reasonable rate should be charged from the date of death. As an incentive to those who could afford it, facility should be given for payment of the duty and interest thereon from death, prior to the grant as at present, but at a lower rate of interest, say at 3 per cent. per annum if duty is paid before grant, and 4 per cent. if paid afterwards. Those really needing the opportunity of first realising the estate would be quite willing to pay for it.

## The Law Society.

The following are the members of the Council of the Law Society who attended the Annual Provincial Meeting of the society at Liverpool on the 13th and 14th of October, 1903: Messrs. J. E. Gray Hill (president), T. Rawle (vice-president), H. Attles, C. M. Barker, H. D. Bateson (Liverpool), J. S. Beale, E. K. Blyth, J. W. Budd, R. Ellett, T. G. Gibson (Newcastle-upon-Tyne), W. E. Gillett, W. H. Gray, H. E. Gribble, W. T. Humphrys, W. G. King, T. Marshall, J. F. Milne, R. Pennington, Sir A. K. Rolitt, M.P., Messrs. C. L. Samson, F. O. Taylor (Norwich), W. Trower.

## The Incorporated Justices' Clerks' Society.

The Justices' Clerks' Society, which has been in existence for sixty-four years, has recently been incorporated under the provisions of section 23 of the Companies Act, 1867, with the licence of the Board of Trade, and the word "limited" may be omitted from the title of the society, which is henceforth to be known as the "Incorporated Justices' Clerks' Society." Among the objects for which the society is established as set out in the memorandum of association are the following: To promote the science of law and especially law administered by justices of the peace in the United Kingdom; to watch the operation of the law and more especially to that administered by justices of the peace in the United Kingdom, and to note defects therein, and to suggest and promote improvements in such law; to watch all proposals for legislation in matters affecting the jurisdiction and administration of justice by justices of peace in England and Wales and to take such steps in regard to the support of or opposition to such pro-



each one.  
and save  
the law  
rdly than  
fault of  
Aggrega-  
eparately  
not be in  
the same  
in which  
nts A or  
and the  
regards  
passed  
property  
but both  
ould be  
ch duty  
te duty  
abilities  
n. My  
ould be  
render-  
appears,  
e and  
licants  
assets.  
one: A  
ted to A  
£800;  
d debts  
e daily  
and not  
estate  
even if  
selves  
ily it  
d this  
Com-  
894 to  
ity in  
ted at  
ished  
every-  
ht be  
and  
o the  
rate  
who  
d in-  
ower  
rant,  
unity

as may seem expedient; to afford means of communication between members of the society, officials, counsel, and others in regard to questions directly or indirectly affecting the administration of justice; to collect, record, and disseminate statistics and information of interest to those engaged in the administration of justice and to Parliament. The president for the year is Mr. J. Chalmers Hunt, of Ware, the vice-president Mr. B. Carrer Rawson, of 11, Queen Victoria-street, and upon the Council are Mr. Theo Christophers, Henley-in-Arden; Mr. Robert Ellett, Cirencester; Mr. T. Holmes Gore, Bristol; Mr. J. Merrick Head, Reigate; Mr. F. G. Hindle, Darwen; Mr. J. R. Roberts, Newcastle; Mr. Edgar C. Sanders, Liverpool; Mr. A. T. Simpson, Tunbridge Wells; Mr. E. Waugh, Haywards Heath; Mr. G. C. Whiteley, Southwark. The secretary is Mr. Henry Rosling, of Bell-street, Reigate, who was appointed to the post on the resignation of his partner Mr. J. Merrick Head. All clerks to justices throughout England and Wales are invited to become members of the society, the subscription being one guinea, payable annually.

### Bristol Incorporated Law Society.

The following are extracts from the report of the Council:  
**Legal Education.**—Two courses of law lectures have been given in conjunction with University College, one on the law of "Real Property and Conveyancing," and one on the law of "Contract"; twenty-five students joined the former course and fifteen the latter. The lecturer was Mr. G. H. Boucher, and his reports of the attendance at and general results of the lectures were satisfactory. Application has been made to the Law Society for a grant in aid, and the matter is still under the consideration of that society, in connection with the whole question of legal education both in London and the provinces. During the year from Bristol eleven articled clerks have passed the Intermediate Examination, and a similar number the Final Examination of the Law Society, and of the latter at the January examination, Mr. R. S. Alston, articled to Messrs. Wansbrough & Co., and at the June examination, Mr. N. H. Pole, articled to the same firm, and Mr. P. V. Stallon, articled to Messrs. Burges & Sloan, were each placed in the Third Class Honours List. A prize of £3 3s. in books was awarded by this society to each of these gentlemen.

**Tolsey Court.**—A deputation from the Council of this society, consisting of the president and Messrs. Barry, Cross, Miller, and F. Sturge, were received by the committee of the town council (to whom the matter of the Tolsey Court had been referred), and placed before them the reasons why it was thought desirable that the court should not be abolished, and urged the amendments in its procedure which had been resolved on by this Council. The chairman, Mr. J. W. S. Dix, promised that what had been agreed should be carefully considered.

**Allowances to Prosecutors and Witnesses in Criminal Cases.**—The report of the Committee of Inquiry on this matter, referred to in the last report, has now been made, and amendments in the existing law and scale of allowances recommended; but these recommendations have not yet been given legislative sanction.

**Solicitors' Robes.**—The Council of this society passed a resolution in favour of solicitors appearing in robes when acting as advocates in county courts, a practice which was already generally followed in this district.

## Law Students' Journal.

### Law Students' Societies.

**LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.**—Oct. 20.—Chairman, Mr. W. E. Singleton.—The subject for debate was: "That the case of *Reynolds v. Jolly & Son (Limited)* (1903, 1 K. B. 87) was wrongly decided." Mr. J. E. C. Adams opened in the affirmative, Mr. J. B. Bernstein seconded in the affirmative; Mr. Neville Tebbutt opened in the negative, Mr. A. E. Hogan seconded in the negative. The following members also spoke: Messrs. H. C. Myers, F. J. Gray, D. C. Cornock, Pleadwell, Leggett, Moulton, Spanton, Bostock, and R. A. Gordon. The opener replied, and the chairman having summed up, the motion was lost by five votes. There were forty-three members present.

**BIRMINGHAM LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.**—Oct. 13.—Mr. H. H. Joy, B.A., barrister-at-law, delivered the first of two lectures on "The Statutes of Limitation." The attendance numbered thirty-five.

Oct. 20.—Mr. G. A. C. Pettitt presided, and the following was the subject for debate: "In 1890 A., a lessee for ninety-nine years at a rack-rent, mortgaged his leasehold interest to B. by sub-demise for the residue of the term less three days. The mortgage contained no covenants by the mortgagee to pay rent or observe the covenants in the lease, but contained a declaration that after a sale under the statutory power the nominal reversion should be held by the mortgagor in trust for the purchaser. A. afterwards purchased the fee simple of the property subject to the lease, but with the benefit of the rent and lessee's covenants. He did not disclose the existence of the mortgage. A few years later he conveyed the property to C. in fee subject to the lease, and C. immediately leased the property back to A. for ninety-nine years at a rack-rent. A. then granted an occupation lease for twenty-one years to D. A. became bankrupt and his trustee disclaimed the three leases. B. and D. each declined to accept a vesting order. Is C. entitled to the property free from incumbrances to the exclusion of B.?" The speakers in the affirmative were Messrs. C. A. A. Elton, H. L. Smith, E. Woodward, A. J. Gateley, and T. H. Cleaver; and in the negative, Messrs. H. W. Lyde, B. E. Crump, T. S. Hooper, W.

Mathews, R. A. Willes, and R. A. Trench. The leaders on both sides having replied, the chairman summed up, and the voting resulted in favour of the affirmative by a majority of two. A vote of thanks to the chairman concluded the proceedings.

## Legal News.

### Information Required.

**DEEDS TO AMERICAN LANDS.**—About 1850 Richard Kiely, of No. 1, Royal Exchange-buildings, London, held power of attorney from Claudian B. Northrop, of Charlestown, North Carolina, to sell large tracts of land in Irwin and adjoining counties in Georgia, U.S.A. It is believed that there are in England holders of deeds issued by him (one such case is known) and they are requested to communicate with G. de G. Griffith, solicitor, 50, Buckingham Palace-road, S.W.

**CHRISTOPHER MILLS (Deceased).**—Any person having the custody of, or any knowledge of, an existing Will of the late Christopher Mills, of 61, Clarendon-road, West Croydon, are requested to communicate with Messrs. Hopgoods & Dowson, 17, Spring-gardens, London, solicitors.

### Changes in Partnerships.

#### Dissolutions.

**GAINSBOROUGH HARWARD, JOHN DONALDSON HARWARD, FREDERIC JAMES BOULTON, and FRANK PERCIVAL EVERS, solicitors (Harwards & Co.),** Stourbridge and Birmingham. June 30. So far as regards the said Frederic James Boulton, who retires from the firm. The said Gainsborough Harward, John Donaldson Harward, and Frank Percival Evers will continue the said business under the present style or firm of "Harwards & Co."

[Gazette, Oct. 20.]

#### General.

Mr. Alfred Lyttelton, K.C., the new Colonial Secretary, is to be entertained by the members of the Oxford Circuit at a dinner in celebration of his appointment to that office.

A person, says the *Law Quarterly Review*, when asked to ride on an engine by an agent authorized to represent the owner thereof, is entitled to be carried with reasonable care. If there is any failure of reasonable care the owner of the engine is responsible for any damage done to the person who has accepted the offer of a gratuitous ride on the engine: *Harris v. Perry & Co.* (1903, 2 K. B. 219, 72 L. J. K. B. 725, C. A.). What, one wonders, are the exact rights of a person who, at the invitation of a friend, takes a ride on a motor-car. Can he recover from his friend compensation for any injury inflicted by the car being driven beyond the rate allowed by law?

The report of the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis for the year 1902 states that during the year 1,722 identifications were made by finger prints, as against 426 in 1900, when anthropometry alone was used, and 503 identifications in 1901, of which 410 were by anthropometry and 93 by finger prints, thus verifying the forecast made last year that "the number of identifications by the new system in 1902 would be three times larger than the highest figures hitherto secured by anthropometry," and it may be predicted, the report adds, with tolerable certainty, that the identifications made in 1903 will be not less than 75 per cent. in excess of the 1902 figures.

At an exhibition, held at the rooms of the Sea Anglers' Society, on Wednesday, says the *Daily Mail*, a fisherman, who when the sea does not call him is a distinguished figure in legal circles, proudly displayed a new kind of bait invented by himself. It was made from old deeds cut up into the shape of little fishes, with their heads and tails outlined with ink. The hook is placed through the eye—indicated with a full stop in ink—and the paper bait is then "cast" in the ordinary way and allowed to wriggle temptingly in the water. The resourceful inventor is understood to have lured many eels with his legal bait. "Their fate," remarked a jealous exhibitor, "was remarkably like that which overtakes human beings who are addicted to litigation. They were skinned."

In opening the proceedings at the meeting of the Association of Municipal Corporations, on Wednesday, Sir Albert K. Rolitt, M.P., referred to the Borough Funds Act, passed by the Government last Session, and said that it was really an Act which embodied their own Bill, which he thought greatly impressed itself on the opinion of the House of Commons. With regard to the question of the law of valuation, there was one part of the valuation law which was still unsatisfactory—namely, that which dealt with the valuation, or rather the non-valuation, of Government properties in many boroughs. A great improvement had been made in bringing the valuation of Government properties up to date, and so reducing the general burden of the ratepayers. The principle governing the valuation of Government properties, however, still existed; and he hoped that something further would be done, in justice to the ratepayer. He congratulated the association that as the result of their efforts the Housing of the Working Classes Bill of last Session had been passed; and if the new Act did not do all they desired, it at least increased the length of term from sixty to eighty years, and what had been accomplished might have the effect of enabling lower rents to be charged, and therefore the poorer class of ratepayer to be more adequately provided for.

Our courts, says the *Journal of the Society of Comparative Legislation*, have arrived at the remarkable conclusion that a telegraph company owes no duty to the sender of the message; there is neither privity of contract nor obligation of care (*Dickson v. Reuter Telegraph Co.*, 3 C. P. D. 1). In America the tendency is the other way—to emphasize rather than minimize the liability of telegraph companies. A State court (in *Western Union Telegraph Co. v. Plant River Lumber*, 88 Am. St. R. 36) has even gone so far as to rule that if a message is delivered to a telegraph company containing an offer to sell merchandise at a certain price, and the company so transmits it as to contain an offer at a less price, the sender is bound to furnish the merchandise at the latter price, and he may recover from the company the damages sustained by complying with the offer. This is startling, and seems to err as much by excess as our law by defect. It may be inconvenient—no doubt it is—to the recipient of a message not to be able to rely implicitly on its correctness, but neither Marconigraph nor cablegram, telegram nor telephonic message possesses the quality of infallibility; the users know it, and they must take these benefits of science with their imperfections. The true remedy seems to lie not in any enlargement of agency, but in imposing on telegraph companies, as has been done generally in the United States, a statutory duty of diligence. Anyone injured by a company's carelessness can then sue it without being embarrassed by questions of contract. This statutory duty is justified in American opinion by the fact that telegraph companies exercise a quasi-public employment, and certainly the part which telegrams now play in our business and social life affords a very good reason for it.

A note, signed F. P., in the current issue of the *Law Quarterly Review*, says that the meeting of the American Bar Association, held in the last week of August at Hot Springs, Virginia, was of special interest in more than one way, being the first held in a Southern State, and partly coinciding with the annual meeting of the Virginia Bar. For an English guest it was a novel and most pleasant experience to be among picked representatives of the profession from New England to Texas, and observe how the shrewd composure of the North, the businesslike energy of the Middle States, and the traditional eloquence of the South, all bore their fitting parts in the serious and fruitful discussion of legislation and legal policy. Nor was opportunity wanting to learn something of the charm of Southern society, or to hear Northern and Southern veterans of the Civil War comparing notes, in the friendliest manner, within a short journey of the Virginian battlefields—but these are not professional topics. Perhaps that which impresses a visitor most is the excellent work being done by the Commission for uniformity of legislation. Already a Negotiable Instruments Act has been passed, with a few minute local variations, in about half the jurisdictions of the United States, and there is good hope that the rest will follow before long. A Sale of Goods Bill has been prepared by Prof. Williston, of Harvard, and a Partnership Bill is to be taken in hand by Prof. Ames. As a rule, the State legislatures have frankly recognized that the improvement of the law is above politics. We may have more to say of this and other matters when the report of the proceedings is published. One thing the visitor did regret, that he had not brought the White Book with him; for the interest of our American brethren in English courts and procedure is as inexhaustible as it is flattering. Only one thing is less exhaustible, American and Virginian hospitality.

## Court Papers. Supreme Court of Judicature.

### ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON

EMERGENCY APPEAL COURT		Mr. Justice KEEWICH.	
Date.	ROTA.	No. 2.	Mr. Justice BYRNE.
Monday, Oct. ....	26 Mr. Carrington	Mr. King	Mr. Pemberton
Tuesday .....	27 Beal	Farmer	Godfrey
Wednesday .....	28 Jackson	King	Pemberton
Thursday .....	29 Pemberton	Farmer	Godfrey
Friday .....	30 Godfrey	King	Pemberton
Saturday .....	31 R. Leach	Farmer	Godfrey
Mr. Justice FARWELL.		Mr. Justice BUCKLEY.	
Date	Mr. Justice FARWELL.	Mr. Justice BUCKLEY.	Mr. Justice JOYCE.
Monday, Oct. ....	26 Mr. Gresswell	Mr. W. Leach	Mr. Church
Tuesday .....	27 Church	Theod	Gresswell
Wednesday .....	28 Gresswell	W. Leach	Beal
Thursday .....	29 Church	Theod	Carrington
Friday .....	30 Gresswell	W. Leach	Beal
Saturday .....	31 Church	Theod	Carrington

### MICHAELMAS SITTINGS, 1903.

#### COURT OF APPEAL.

##### APPEAL COURT I.

Final, Interlocutory and New Trial Appeals from the King's Bench Division. Final and Interlocutory Appeals from the Admiralty Division, and Cases in In re The Workmen's Compensation Act, or other Business proposed to be taken in this Court, will, from time to time, be announced in the Daily Cause List.

##### APPEAL COURT II.

Final and Interlocutory Appeals from the Chancery Division, the Probate and Divorce Division, Bankruptcy and Lunacy Appeals and Appeals from the Lancaster and Durham Palatine Courts, or other Business proposed to be taken in this Court, will, from time to time, be announced in the Daily Cause List.

#### HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

##### CHANCERY DIVISION.

##### CHANCERY COURT I.

##### Mr. Justice KEEWICH.

Except when other Business is advertised in the Daily Cause List Mr. Justice KEEWICH will take Actions with Witnesses daily throughout the Sittings to the exclusion of other Business.

##### CHANCERY COURT II.

##### Mr. Justice BYRNE.

Except when other Business is advertised in the Daily Cause List Mr. Justice BYRNE will take Actions with Witnesses daily throughout the Sittings to the exclusion of other Business.

#### KING'S BENCH COURT I.

##### Mr. Justice SWINFEN EADY.

Except when other Business is advertised in the Daily Cause List Mr. Justice SWINFEN EADY will take Actions with Witnesses daily throughout the Sittings.

#### LORD CHANCELLOR'S COURT.

##### Mr. Justice FARWELL.

Sat., Oct. 24.	Mots
Monday .....	26. Mots and gen pa
Tuesday .....	27. General paper
Wednesday .....	28. General paper
Thursday .....	29. General paper
Friday .....	30. Mots and gen pa
Saturday .....	31. Liverpool and Manchester business
Mon., Nov. 2.	Sitting in chambers
Tuesday .....	3. Sht caus, pets, and gen pa
Wednesday .....	4. General paper
Thursday .....	5. Mots and gen pa
Friday .....	6. Sht caus, pets, and gen pa
Monday .....	9. Sitting in chambers
Tuesday .....	10. General paper
Wednesday .....	11. General paper
Thursday .....	12. Mots and gen pa
Friday .....	13. Manchester and Liverpool business
Monday .....	16. Sitting in chambers
Tuesday .....	17. Sht caus, pets, and gen pa
Wednesday .....	18. General paper
Thursday .....	19. Mots and gen pa
Friday .....	20. Sht caus, pets, and gen pa
Monday .....	23. Sitting in chambers
Tuesday .....	24. General paper
Wednesday .....	25. General paper
Thursday .....	26. Mots and gen pa
Friday .....	27. Liverpool and Manchester business
Monday .....	30. Sitting in chambers
Tues., Dec. 1.	Sht caus, pets, and gen pa
Wednesday .....	2. General paper
Thursday .....	3. Mots and gen pa
Friday .....	4. Sht caus, pets, and gen pa
Monday .....	7. Sitting in chambers
Tuesday .....	8. General paper
Wednesday .....	9. General paper
Thursday .....	10. Mots and gen pa
Friday .....	11. Manchester and Liverpool business
Saturday .....	12. Sitting in chambers
Monday .....	15. Sitting in chambers
Tuesday .....	16. Sht caus, pets, and gen pa
Wednesday .....	17. General paper
Thursday .....	18. Mots and gen pa
Friday .....	19. Sht caus, pets, and gen pa
Monday .....	22. Sitting in chambers

Any cause intended to be heard as a short cause must be so marked in the cause book at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard. Two copies of minutes of the proposed judgment or order, must be left in Court with the Judge's Clerk one clear day before the cause is to be put in the Paper.

N.B.—The following papers on further consideration are required for the use of the Judge, viz.:—Two copies of minutes of the proposed judgment or order, 1 copy pleadings, and 1 copy master's certificate, which must be left in Court with the Judge's Clerk one clear day before the further consideration is ready to come into the paper.

#### CHANCERY COURT IV.

##### Mr. Justice BUCKLEY.

Sat., Oct. 24.	Mots
Monday .....	26. Mots and non-wit list
Tuesday .....	27. Companies Acts and non-wit list
Wednesday .....	28. Non-wit list
Thursday .....	29. Mots and non-wit list
Friday .....	30. Sht caus, pets, procedure sums, and non-wit list
Monday .....	3. Sitting in chambers
Tuesday .....	4. Companies Acts and non-wit list
Wednesday .....	5. Non-wit list
Thursday .....	6. Mots and non-wit list
Friday .....	7. Sht caus, pets, procedure sums, and non-wit list
Saturday .....	9. Sitting in chambers
Tuesday .....	10. Companies Acts and non-wit list
Wednesday .....	11. Non-wit list
Thursday .....	12. Mots and non-wit list
Friday .....	13. Sht caus, pets, procedure sums, and non-wit list
Saturday .....	14. Sitting in chambers
Monday .....	16. Sitting in chambers
Tuesday .....	17. Companies Acts and non-wit list

Wednesday 18	Non-wit list
Thursday .....	19. Mots and non-wit list
Friday .....	20. Sht caus, pets, procedure sums, and non-wit list
Saturday .....	21. Sitting in chambers
Monday .....	23. Companies Acts and non-wit list
Tuesday .....	24. Non-wit list
Wednesday 25	Non-wit list
Thursday .....	26. Mots and non-wit list
Friday .....	27. Sht caus, pets, procedure sums, and non-wit list
Saturday .....	28. Sitting in chambers
Monday .....	30. Companies Acts and non-wit list
Tues., Dec. 1	Non-wit list
Wednesday 2	Non-wit list
Thursday .....	3. Mots and non-wit list
Friday .....	4. Sht caus, pets, procedure sums, and non-wit list
Monday .....	7. Sitting in chambers
Tuesday .....	8. Companies Acts and non-wit list
Wednesday 9	Non-wit list
Thursday .....	10. Mots and non-wit list
Friday .....	11. Sht caus, pets, procedure sums, and non-wit list
Saturday .....	12. Sitting in chambers
Monday .....	14. Sitting in chambers
Tuesday .....	15. Companies Acts and non-wit list
Wednesday 16	Non-wit list
Thursday .....	17. Mots and non-wit list
Friday .....	18. Sht caus, pets, procedure sums, and non-wit list (if any) and non-wit list
Saturday .....	19. Remaining sht caus, pets, procedure sums, and non-wit list
Monday .....	21. Sitting in chambers

Any cause intended to be heard as a short cause must be so marked in the cause book at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard. The necessary papers, including two copies of the minutes of the proposed judgment or order, must be left in the Court with the Judge's Clerk one clear day before the cause is to be put in the paper, in default the cause will not be put in the paper.

N.B.—The following Papers on Further Consideration are required for the use of the Judge, viz.:—Two Copies of Minutes of the proposed Judgment or Order, 1 Copy Pleadings, and 1 Copy Master's Certificate. These must be left in Court with the Judge's Clerk one clear day before the Further Consideration is ready to come into the Paper.

#### CHANCERY COURT III.

##### Mr. Justice JOYCE.

Sat., Oct. 24.	Mots
Monday .....	26. Mots con and non-wit list
Tuesday .....	27. Non-wit list
Wednesday 28	Non-wit list
Thursday .....	29. Mots and non-wit list
Friday .....	30. Sht caus, pets, procedure sums, and non-wit list
Saturday .....	31. Sitting in chambers
Mon., Nov. 2	Sitting in chambers
Tuesday .....	3. Wit Acts (retained)
Wednesday .....	4. Non-wit list
Thursday .....	5. Non-wit list
Friday .....	6. Mots and non-wit list
Saturday .....	7. Sht caus, pets, procedure sums, and non-wit list
Monday .....	9. Sitting in chambers
Tuesday .....	10. Non-wit list
Wednesday 11	Non-wit list
Thursday .....	12. Mots and non-wit list
Friday .....	13. Sht caus, pets, procedure sums, and non-wit list
Saturday .....	14. Sitting in chambers
Monday .....	16. Sitting in chambers
Tuesday .....	17. Non-wit list
Wednesday 18	Non-wit list
Thursday .....	19. Mots and non-wit list
Friday .....	20. Sht caus, pets, procedure sums, and non-wit list
Saturday .....	21. Sitting in chambers
Monday .....	23. Sitting in chambers
Tuesday .....	24. Non-wit list
Wednesday 25	Non-wit list
Thursday .....	26. Mots and non-wit list
Friday .....	27. Sht caus, pets, procedure sums, and non-wit list
Saturday .....	28. Sitting in chambers
Monday .....	30. Sitting in chambers
Tues., Dec. 1	Non-wit list
Wednesday 2	Non-wit list
Thursday .....	3. Mots and non-wit list
Friday .....	4. Sht caus, pets, procedure sums, and non-wit list
Saturday .....	5. Sitting in chambers
Monday .....	7. Sitting in chambers
Tuesday .....	8. Non-wit list
Wednesday 9	Non-wit list
Thursday .....	10. Mots and non-wit list
Friday .....	11. Sht caus, pets, procedure sums, and non-wit list
Saturday .....	12. Sitting in chambers
Monday .....	14. Sitting in chambers



clude

In the Matter of the Companies Acts, 1862 to 1900, and In the Matter of the Yeoman Railway Spike Syndicate, 1d appl of John Richardson from order of Mr Justice Buckley, dated March 4, 1903 March 17.

Wilde v Thompson appl of plfff from order of Mr Justice Buckley, dated March 13, 1903 March 28

In re The Patent, Designs and Trade Marks Acts, 1883 to 1888, and In re The Registered Trade Mark, No 241,492 of The Neostyle Manufacturing Co ld appl of David Gestelner from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated March 10, 1903 March 30

Nettlefield v Clark appl of debt from order of Mr Justice Buckley, dated Dec 19, 1902 March 30

Radcliffe v Woods and anr appl of plfff from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Dec 11, 1902 April 2

Newman's Exploration Co ld v Hassell appl of plffs from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated March 17, 1903 April 6

Kendal v Mayor, &c, of Lewisham appl of plfff from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated April 1, 1903 April 6

Honywood v Honeywood and ors appl of debts from order of Mr Justice Byrne, dated April 2, 1903 April 7

Crosfield v Manchester Ship Canal Co appl of debts from order of Mr Justice Byrne, dated April 7, 1903 (produce order) s o for 3 weeks after date of judgment entered April 8

Wilkinson v The Llandaff and Dinas Powis Rural District Council appl of debt from order of Mr Justice Phillimore, dated March 27, and cross notice by plfff dated April 15, 1903 April 9

Boyton v Driscoll appl of debt from order of Mr Justice Byrne, dated March 3, 1903 April 9

Fels and anr v Christopher Thomas & Bros ld appl of plffs from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated March 31, 1903 April 16

In re Simpson, dec Simpson v Simpson and ors appl of debts from order of Mr Justice Buckley, dated March 12, 1903 April 18

In re E W Rayner, dec Rayner and ors v Rayner and ors (Liverpool D R) appl of debts from order of Mr Justice Farwell, dated March 30, 1903, and cross notice by trustee, dated April 20, 1903 April 21

Chapman v Manton appl of debt from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Feb 21, 1903 April 21

The Ely Brewery Co ld v The Pontypridd Urban District Council (Cardiff D R) appl of plffs from order of Mr Justice Bruce at Cardiff, dated March 28, 1903 April 22

The London United Tramways (1900) ld v Ashby's Staines Brewery ld appl of debts from order of Mr Justice Byrne, dated March 24, 1903 April 23

In re Wharnciffe's Trusts The Rt Hon F John Earl Wharnciffe v The Right Hon C B Stuart Wortley, and ors appl of plfff from order of Mr Justice Buckley, dated March 31, 1903 April 23

Cornbrook Brewery Co ld v Law Debenture Corpn ld appl of plffs from order of Mr Justice Byrne, dated April 8, 1903 April 24

In re Osborne's Settlement Cox v Ventris appl of plfff from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated April 21, 1903 April 29

In the Matter of Arthur Duncombe Shafte, dec Fawcett v Shafte appl of debt Charles O D Shafte from order of Mr Justice Buckley, dated March 12, 1903 April 29

Tattershall v Cooper appl of plfff from order of Mr Justice Byrne, dated April 6, 1903 May 5

Prior v Osborne appl of debt from order of Mr Justice Buckley, dated May 1, 1903 (security ordered) May 13

Nicholas v Ridley appl of debt from order of Mr Justice Byrne, dated Feb 28, 1903 May 15

The Houlder Line ld v Langton Grange SS Co ld appl of debts from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated March 20, 1903 May 16

The London County Council v The South Metropolitan Gas Co appl of debts from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated May 4, 1903 May 16

Fels and Another v Stephenson Bros ld appl of plffs from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated March 31, 1903 May 16

Podmore v Sawyer appl of debt from order of Mr Justice Buckley, dated May 5, 1903 May 18

In re Petrolite and Other Patent Fuel Co ld and Le Boulanger appl of F Le Boulanger and others from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated May 8, 1903 May 21

Fels and another v Thomas Hedley & Co ld appl of plffs from order of Mr Justice Byrne, dated March 20, 1903 May 22

In re The Companies Acts, 1862 to 1893 and Re London Riverside Cold Storage Co ld appl of A. W. Rodger from order of Mr Justice Byrne, dated May 21, 1903 (produce order) May 26

In re FitzGerald's Settlement Surman v Fitz Gerald appl of defendant G T M S V Fitz Gerald from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated March 24, 1903 May 26 Same v Same appl of defendant Sir W G S V Fitz Gerald from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated March 24, 1903 May 26

In re Johnson, dec Greenwood and anr v Greenwood and anr appl of defendant A Robinson from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated May 20, 1903 May 27

Keith v Gancia and ors appl of plaintiff from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated April 1, 1903 May 28

Duff v Fleming and ors appl of J Duff, plaintiff, from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated May 2, 1903 May 29

How v Winterton appl of plfff from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Dec 11, 1902 (s o until further order—produce order) June 3

In re Charles Pawley, dec Pawley and ors v Pawley and ors appl of plffs from an order of Mr Justice Farwell, dated Feb 12, 1903 June 4

In re Thomas Crook, dec, and In re the Trusts of an Agreement of Compromise, dated Oct 15, 1887 Crook v Barraclough appl of M A U C Cooper from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated April 29, 1903 June 8

Thompson and anr v Burton and anr appl of plffs from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated May 18, 1903 June 8

Tarkwa Main Reef ld and ors v Merton and anr appl of debt F. Newton from order of Mr Justice Swinfen Eady, dated March 31, 1903 June 9

Cooper and ors v Taylor appl of plffs from order of Mr Justice Buckley, dated April 24, 1903 June 10

Ex parte The Midland Ry Co. In the Matter of the Midland Ry Co. Act, 1891, 1894, 1897, and 1899, and the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845 appl of petars from refusal of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated May 12, 1903 June 17

In re Beachey Heaton and anr v Beachey and ors appl of debts from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Nov 19, 1902 June 18

In the Matter of the Estate of Sir E J Dean Paul, dec Beavan v Pearce appl of debt from order of Mr Justice Farwell, dated Feb 20, 1903 June 22

Gibbs v Sheppard appl of debts from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated May 27, 1903 June 22

Wilcox v Steel appl of plfff from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated March 24, 1903 June 24

(To be continued.)

## HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

CHANCERY DIVISION.

MICHAELMAS SITTINGS, 1903.

## NOTICES RELATING TO THE CHANCERY CAUSE LIST.

Motions, Petitions, and Short Causes will be taken on the days stated in the Michaelmas Sittings Paper.

Mr. Justice KEKEWICH.—Except when other business is advertised in the Daily Cause List, Mr. Justice Kekewich will sit for the disposal of his lordship's Witness List daily throughout the sittings to the exclusion of other business.

Mr. Justice BYRNE.—Except when other business is in the Daily Cause List, Mr. Justice Byrne will sit for the disposal of his lordship's Witness List daily throughout the sittings to the exclusion of other business.

Mr. Justice FARWELL.—The retained action with witnesses will be taken by Mr. Justice Farwell on a day to be announced in the Daily Cause List. Liverpool and Manchester Business.—Mr. Justice Farwell will take Liverpool and Manchester business as follows: 1. Motions, Short Causes, Petitions and Adjourned Summonses on every other Saturday, commencing with Saturday, 31st October; 2. Summonses in chambers will be taken on every other Saturday, commencing with Saturday, 31st October.

Mr. Justice BUCKLEY will take his business as announced in the Michaelmas Sittings Paper.

Mr. Justice JOYCE will take the retained Witness Actions on 3rd November.

Mr. Justice SWINFEN EADY.—Except when other business is advertised in the Daily Cause List, Mr. Justice Swinfen Eady will take actions with witnesses daily throughout the sittings.

Summonses before the Judge in Chambers.—Justices FARWELL, BUCKLEY, and JOYCE will sit in court the whole day on every Monday during the sittings to hear chamber summonses (except Monday, October 26th).

Summonses Adjourned into Court will be taken as follows: Mr. Justice KEKEWICH as stated in the Daily Cause List; Mr. Justice BYRNE, with Non-Witness Actions on days to be announced; Mr. Justice FARWELL with Non-Witness Actions; Mr. Justice BUCKLEY with Non-Witness Actions; Mr. Justice JOYCE, with Non-Witness Actions; and Mr. Justice SWINFEN EADY, as stated in the Daily Cause List.

## SPECIAL NOTICE WITH REFERENCE TO THE CHANCERY WITNESS LISTS.

During the Michaelmas Sittings the judges will sit for the disposal of Witness Actions as follows:

Mr. Justice KEKEWICH will take his Witness List as announced above.

Mr. Justice BYRNE will take his Witness List as announced above.

Mr. Justice FARWELL will take the retained Witness Action as announced above.

Mr. Justice JOYCE will take the retained Witness Actions as announced above.

Mr. Justice SWINFEN EADY will take his Witness List as announced above.

## Chancery Causes for Trial or Hearing.

(Set down to October 15th, 1903.)

Before Mr. Justice KEKEWICH.

Retained by Order.

Motions.

Part v Part pt hd

In re Plymouth Hotels ld (with witnesses)

Wason v Royal British Bank (Oct 26)

Schofield v Allen (with witnesses—Oct 26)

Adjourned Summonses.

In re Atkinson Barbers' Co v Smith pt hd

In re Downman Downman v Bower pt hd

In re Lingham Brooke v National Benevolent Institution pt hd

In re Earl De la Warr's Settled Estates and Settled Land Acts pt hd

In re Goodman Ashford v Ashford (with witnesses) pt hd

Gordon v Maude

In re Marston Toynbee v The American Board of Commrs for Foreign Missions pt hd

Causes for Trial (with Witnesses).

McCaw, Stevenson, &amp; Orr ld v Nickols &amp; Co act (without pleadings by order, head of Paper, Oct 26)

Stevens v Hoare act (stayed until return of Commission, by order)

Hoole v Speak act (not before Nov 23)

Timoeus v Timoeus act

Levi v Taylor act

The North American Land and Timber Co ld v Watkins act (stayed until return of Commission)



Pringle v Blencowe act and counter-claim and m f j and m f j by depts Byron and Prickard against depts Price, Dashwood, Blunt, Crane, Stone, Whinney, and South  
 Currie v Macmeikan act  
 Wheeler v Chanter act (s o not before Dec 1)  
 Westwood v Rayward act  
 Harris v Moore act  
 Anderson v Collins act  
 Mellors v Smallwood act and counter-claim  
 Betteridge v Bowling act  
 Robinson v Brand act and counter-claim (not before Nov 2)  
 Hardy v Davis act  
 T Ashley & Sons ld v T Ashley and ors act  
 In re Horlock Roylance v Horlock act  
 Cearnikow v The Dorking Rural District Council act  
 Harris v Weingarten act and counter-claim  
 B M Clarke & Co v Fraser act and counter-claim  
 In re Phillips Phillips v Llewellyn act  
 Wolsey v Weld Blundell act  
 Steward v The Granular Yeast Co ld act  
 Fuller v Parrish act and counter-claim  
 Weingarten v Sherwood & Co act  
 Craggs v Craggs act  
 Siddall v Wood act  
 Powys-Keck v Powys-Keck act  
 In re Wheatley Wheatley v Wheatley act  
 Fairbairn v Mines & Banking Corp, ld act  
 Jones v Jones act & counter-claim  
 Brailsford v The Barnsley Brewery Co, ld act  
 Barford v Roberts act & counter-claim  
 Owen v The Stancliffe Estates Co, ld act  
 Shipley v Herdman act  
 Skelton v Dowell act  
 Lamport v Brown act & counter-claim  
 Aston v The Romford Rural District Council act & counter-claim  
 Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, ld v Thomson act (Bath D.R.)  
 The Jandus Arc Lamp & Electric Co, ld v Arc Lamps, ld act  
 Novello & Co ld v Potter act  
 Calf v Sampson act  
 Kine v Jolly act  
 Wright v Baker act  
 Silverstein v Barnett act  
 British Home and Hospital for Incurables v Royal Hospital for Incurables and ors act  
 Mac Callum v The Joint Stock Investment Co ld act (pleadings to be delivered)  
 J & J Colman ld v Myers & Son act  
 Pauling v Harvie act and m f j  
 Mayo v Seaton Urban District Council act (set down by order—pleadings to be delivered)  
 Arrowsmith v Bell act  
 Brodie v Selson act  
 Kirby v London Chatham & Dover Ry Co act  
 Wurm v Webster & Girling act  
 In re Stanley Harrison v Stanley act  
 Jones v Bell act  
 Balchin v Lord Ebury act

Before Mr. Justice BYRNE.  
 Retained by Order.

Adjourned Summonses.  
 In re Pigeon Surgey v Pigeon adjd sums pt hd (with witnesses by order)

In re Fraser Lowther v Fraser adjd sums (s o generally) pt hd  
 In re Seaton, dec Seaton v Seaton adjd sums (s o generally) pt hd  
 In re Lord Stafford's Settled Estates and In re The Settled Land Acts, 1882 to 1890 adjd sums  
 In re Lord Stafford's Will Gerard v Stafford adjd sums  
 Petitions.  
 In re Hartopp's Estates and Midland Ry Co  
 In re De Falbe Ward v Taylor (s o generally) pt hd  
 In re Thomas' Trusts pt hd  
 Talbot v Scarisbrick (s o generally) pt hd

#### Motions.

Clay v Pidcock  
 Pannell v Ball  
 The County of Middlesex Light Rys Order, 1901 pt hd

Causes for Trial (with witnesses).  
 In re H Petch, dec Petch v Mallett act (s o for appointment of Legal Representative)  
 Fels v Hodgson & Simpson act (s o until Chancery Appeal disposed of)  
 Hooper & Ashby and ors v The Phoenix Wharf and Coal Co ld act (s o 2nd Monday, Hilary, 1904)

Claghten v Foster act  
 Fuller v Handy act  
 Barnett v Levy act  
 Addison v Singleton and ors act  
 McDiarmid v Hamnett act (s o for appointment of Legal Representative)  
 Asbestine Safety Light Co v Azolite act  
 The Anglo-American Construction Co ld v J E Clark and M Clark act  
 Edwardes and anr v Cotton and ors act  
 Jones v C. H. Lloyd Edwards and anr act

In re John Newton's Estate Brown v Cooke and ors act  
 Sandow v Szalay act  
 Robinson v Norman and anr act  
 Welcome v Thomson & Capper act

In the Matter of the Trade Marks, Nos. 36,154, 36,155, 42,378, 42,379, 225,812-3-4-5-6, and the Patent, Designs, and Trade Marks Acts, 1883 to 1888 act  
 Girling v Trimmer act  
 Shafto and anr v Browell act  
 Werner Motors ld v Gamage ld act  
 Vezey v Rashleigh and ors act  
 In re Pawley Pawley v Pawley adjd sums (with witnesses, by order)

The Law Guarantee and Trust Society ld v Parsonage and ors act

Barrs v Leicester Co-operative Society act  
 Vezey v Grayston act  
 Jones v Wintle and ors act  
 Mentz v Boyd act

In re Harvey, dec Harvey v Millet act  
 Porter v Lewis (Bristol D R) act  
 In re The Yorkshire Patent Glazing Co ld J Lyons & Co ld The Company Cranshaw v The Company acts (consolidated)  
 Sayce v Butcher act

Betts v Betts and ors act and counter-claim

In the Matter of Patent, No 1,110 of 1890, of C A Hitchcock and In the Matter of the Patent, Design and Trade Mark Acts, 1883 to 1888 petn (set down by order)

Skeel v James Smith & Sons, Norwood, ld act Same v Same act  
 Deards v Curtis, Gardner, & Co ld act and motion by order  
 Schenley v Smith act  
 The Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co ld v The North British Rubber Co ld act  
 Williams v Parry act  
 In re Francis Jackson Kent, dec E C Thurgood v F J Kent and ors originating sums (set down by order of Court of Appeal)

Before Mr. Justice FARWELL.  
 Retained by Order.

Cause for Trial (with Witnesses).  
 Hills v Walker & Sons act (stayed until 14 days after return of Commission, by order of Master, dated Aug 10, 1903)

Causes for Trial (without Witnesses and Adjourned Summonses).  
 Phillips v Seaborne motn for judgt (s o with liberty to apply to enter in Witness List)

Byrne v Fraser motn for judgt (short) s o pending compromise  
 In re Lacey Turner v Lacey adjd sums  
 In re Jenkins Sketch v Williams adjd sums

In re Goddard, Stanton and Hudson, Solrs adjd sums  
 In re Helicoid Locknut Patents (Parent) Co ld Gibbons v The Company adjd sums

In re Hilliard Bradbury v Sandwith adjd sums  
 In re E Buckeridge's Estate Buckeridge v Buckeridge adjd sums  
 In re Steinmetz Boyd v Pownall adjd sums

In re Wrightson's Will Trusts  
 In re Wrightson's Will Battie-Wrightson v Thomas adjd sums  
 Lancashire, Derbyshire and East Coast Ry Acts, 1891 to 1895, and In re London and East Coast Ry and Docks Acts, 1897 to 1902 adjd sums

In re Cokeley Penney v Murray adjd sums  
 In re Chenery Howard v McMellan 2 adjd sums  
 In re Coussmaker Coussmaker v Blakeney adjd sums

In re Shackle, dec Elliston v Wheeler adjd sums  
 Mitchell v Gale adjd sums  
 In re Duncombe & Duncombe's Contract and V. and P. Act adjd sums

In re Sutcliffe Furniss v Hirst adjd sums  
 In re Tuck Nicholls v Tuck adjd sums

In Redfern's Estate Gwyer v Redfern adjd sums  
 In re Martin's Settlement Martin v Martin adjd sums  
 In re Tennant, dec and Trustee Act

In re Worthington Bingham v Keele adjd sums  
 In re Tattersall Tattersall v Armitage adjd sums  
 In re Tattersall Armitage v Kelly adjd sums to come on together

In re Ogilvie Trusts Robinson v Ogilvie adjd sums (day to be fixed)  
 In re Ogilvie Trusts Allen v Ogilvie adjd sums (day to be fixed)

In re Taylor Tanner v Gardiner adjd sums  
 In re Sebright and In re Settled Land Acts, 1882 to 1890 adjd sums

In re Application, No 249,746, In re Application, No 249,747 and In re Patents, Designs, and Trade-Marks Act motn ordered to go into Non-Witness List  
 In re Partridge Allen v Hornblowe adjd sums  
 In re Palmer's Settlement Palmer v Innes adjd sums  
 In re Blewitt's Estate In re Scholey's Estate James v Blewitt m f j  
 In re Cawley Cawley v Cawley m f j

In re King Insurance Co ld and reduced and In re Companies Act, 1867 and 1877 adjd sums  
 Whitlam v Martin adjd sums  
 Neale v Crundall m f j  
 Wynne Finch v Chaytor motn entered in Non-Witness List (by order)

In re Houstoun's Settlement Sparks v Hachell adjd sums  
 In re Newbon Daniel v Newbon adjd sums

In re Rowden Allen v Rowden adjd sums  
 Lowitz v Stumpf m f j (short)  
 In re Musgrave Gyllencrutz v Musgrave adjd sums

Cleland v Elven motn for judgt (short)  
 In re Schofield Booth v Schofield adjd sums

In re Mackenzie Mackenzie v Dick adjd sums  
 Buckley v Turner adjd sums  
 In re Churchill's Estate Musgrave v l'Anson adjd sums

Chas H Huss ld v Lindahl motn for judgt  
 Lloyd's Bank ld v Bowyer adjd sums

In re Friday Chandler v Friday adjd sums (restored after certificate produced)

In re H C Clifton's Trusts Marshall v Marshall adjd sums  
 In re Nunnery Creak v Thrower adjd sums  
 In re Elliott Elliott v The King adjd sums

#### Further Consideration.

In re Musgrave Gyllencrutz v Musgrave fur con (restored)  
 In re The Greymouth Point Elizabeth Ry and Coal Co ld

Yuill v The Greymouth Point Elizabeth Ry and Coal Co ld fur and adjd sums

In re Sweettenham Symons v Fry fur con

In re Flint Cobbe v Ingle fur con  
 Weld Blundell v Wolsey fur con

Before Mr. Justice BUCKLEY.

Further Considerations.  
 Knott v MacCallum fur con (s o for appointment of legal representative)

In re W Holmes' Estate A L Shann and anr v M A Chambers and ors fur con and adjd sums  
 In re Easton, Anderson, & Gooden ld Wilson v The Company fur con

E McLoughlin v F Brennan fur con

British Pioneer Electric Light and Power Co of India ld v Bingham fur con by original act Bingham v British Pioneer Electric Light and Power Co of India ld fur con by counter-claim

Causes for Trial Without Witnesses and Adjourned Summonses.  
 The Eaton Saxon Brewery Co Dalby v The Company Dale v The Company motn for judgt (s o until further order)

In re Bonham Lyon v Belcher  
adjd sums (s o for appointment  
of legal representative)  
Reeve v Jones adjd sums  
In re Howorth Langestret v  
Howorth adjd sums  
In re Pilleaus Pilleau v Pulling  
adjd sums  
Willes v Wilde  
In re Elliott Elliott v Elliott adjd  
sums  
The Company of the Proprietors of  
the Norfolk Estuary v Flanders  
m f j  
Montifore v Guedalla adjd sums  
Smith v Watson adjd sums  
In re White, dec Lush v Lush  
adjd sums  
In re Susan Duffield, dec Hewitt v  
Duffield adjd sums  
In re M L Hay, dec Kerr v Stinear  
adjd sums  
In re Smith, dec Smith v Barrett  
adjd sums  
In re William Malthouse, dec Malt-  
house v Malthouse adjd sums  
In re Patents, &c, Acts, 1883 & 1888  
and In re Klaber's Patent (1902  
K 0,146) adjd sums In re  
Patent, &c, Acts, 1883 & 1888 and  
In re Klaber's Patent (1902 K  
0,147) adjd sums  
In re Frank Rollason Rollason v  
Rollason adjd sums  
In re Somerset's Settlement In re  
Campbell's Settlement Hopkin-  
son v Graham adjd sums  
Priestman v Wilson adjd sums  
In re J H Ross, dec Ross v Water-  
field & ors adjd sums  
In re J T P Smith, dec Smith v  
Smith adjd sums  
In re Barkworth's Settlement  
Heathcote v Gadesden and ors  
adjd sums  
In re Burdett Coutts and Elliott's  
Contract and In re the Vendor  
and Purchaser Act, 1874 adjd  
sums  
In re G E Wood, dec Wood v  
Anderson adjd sums  
In re Keith, dec Keith v Smith  
adjd sums  
In re Coast Development Co ld and  
Walker's Contract adjd sums  
In re J White, dec and In re J  
Dennett, dec and the Settled  
Land Acts White v White adjd  
sums  
In re C Stephens' Will Kilby v  
Betts adjd sums  
The Property and Estates Co ld v  
Bird adjd sums  
In re A A H Richardson, dec Parry  
v Holmes adjd sums  
Barff v Allen adjd sums  
In re Blunt's Trusts Wigan v  
Brown and Green adjd sums  
In re Whitelock, dec Close v  
Taylor adjd sums  
In re A N Royds, dec and S L Acts,  
1882 and 1890 Royds v Lynch  
adjd sums  
In re Mark Mordecai Mordecai v  
Mordecai adjd sums (restored)  
In re Wilson dec Wade v Wade  
adjd sums  
In re Grayston's Settled Trusts and  
In re The Trustee Act 1893 adjd  
sums  
In re Holden dec Wells & anr v  
Holden & ors adjd sums  
In re Lord Coleridge's Settlement  
Trusts Coleridge v Bigham and  
ors adjd sums  
In re The Church Patronage Trusts  
Lawrie and ors v Attorney-Gen.  
adjd sums  
In re Jones Stock v Hyde adjd  
sums  
H P Truitt ld v Edney two adjd  
summons

In re James Huson dec Perkin v  
Huson adjd sums  
In re James Loveridge dec Pearce  
v Marsh adjd sums  
In re Buckell dec Buckell v Buckell  
adjd sums  
Giffard v The Islington Corp and  
anr act without witnesses  
In re Stillwell's Settlement Franey  
and anr v Hough adjd sums  
In re Swann, Bradley & Co, Solrs,  
&c adjd sums  
In re Bailey's Estate Large v  
Bailey adjd sums  
In re Critchley's Estate Crewdson  
v Edwards adjd sums  
In re Charles Sibbick & Co ld  
Livesey v The Company ld adjd  
sums  
In re Icke & Sharp ld Icke &  
Sharp ld v Icke adjd sums  
In re George Dickinson, dec  
Browne v Stickney adjd sums  
In re Philpot & Murton, Solrs,  
and In re the Solicitors Act,  
1843 adjd sums  
In re Stratton's Will and Trustee  
Act adjd sums  
In re John Rodda, dec Rodda v  
Hoeking adjd sums  
Tott-nham Wool and Hair Works  
ld v Boundary Wool and Hair  
Works adjd sums  
In re Thomas Murrell, dec, Ellis v  
Murrell adjd sums  
In re Deakin's Estate Kenworthy  
v Deakin adjd sums  
In re L M Wills, dec Hornbuckle  
v Hornbuckle adjd sums  
In re Reynolds' Settlement Reyn-  
olds v Bateman adjd sums  
In re Osborn and Whitfield's Con-  
tract and Vendor and Purchaser  
Act, 1874 adjd sums  
In re Miryless, dec Miryless v  
Miryless adjd sums  
In re Robert Barclay Brown, dec  
Ingall v Brown & ors (with leave  
to cross-examine on affidavit)  
adjd sums  
In re St Augustine's Diamond  
Mining Co ld Same v Same  
In re Palmer, dec Eaton v Palmer  
The New Sharlston Collieries Co ld  
v The West Riding Ry Committee  
motn for judgt  
In re Tuck Tuck v Tuck  
In re Seafried Denne v Webb  
two adjd sums  
In re Coussmaker's Estate Bowen v  
Coussmaker adjd sums  
In re Frere's Estate Frere v Allen  
adjd sums  
In re Benjamin E Fisher, Solr and  
In re The Solicitors Act, 1843  
adjd sums  
In re D Theyer, dec Theyer v  
Theyer adjd sums  
In re Shean Barnwell v Barnwell  
adjd sums  
In re Earle Tucker v Earle adjd  
sums  
In re Herbert, dec Herbert v Hill  
adjd sums  
In re Smith, dec Gill v Wood adjd  
sums  
In re Sheldon, dec Rankin v Glover  
adjd sums  
In re Thomas McDermott, dec  
Mc Dermott v Mc Dermott adjd  
sums  
In re Absolute Assee Co ld Ward  
v The Company adjd sums  
In re Earl of Harrington and  
Robert Holbrook's Contract and  
Vendor and Purchaser Act,  
1874 adjd sums  
In re B G Lake's Trusts Cox v  
O'Reilly and ors adjd sums  
Empress of Gwalia ld v Foster act  
without witnesses (by order—  
without pleadings)

Companies (Winding-up) and  
Chancery Division.  
Companies (Winding-up).  
Petitions.  
Caledonian Engineering Co ld (petn  
of W Monington—witnesses—s o  
from Nov 11, 1902, pending trial  
of action)  
Same (petn of John Rigby & Sons  
ld—s o from Aug 4 to Oct 27,  
1903)  
London & South Counties Press ld  
petn of Gus Harte—s o from  
Aug 4, 1903, until after appeal)  
Industrial Inventions Development  
Co ld (petn of P A A Twynnam—  
s o from July 7, 1903, for Official  
Receiver to report)  
Electric Tramways Construction &  
Maintenance Co ld (petn of E  
Horton & ors—s o from July 28  
to Oct 27, 1903)  
Cory Miller Patent Fuel Syndicate  
ld (petn of Evans Bros—s o from  
Aug 4 to Oct 27, 1903)  
Mewossoo (Taquah) Gold Mines ld  
(petn of Julius Marx & ors—s o  
from Aug to Oct 27, 1903)  
Seaside Hotels ld (petn of C G Reed  
& Son ld—s o from Aug 4 to Oct  
27, 1903)  
Forest Oak Steam Shipping Co ld  
(petn of Ed T Agius ld—s o from  
Aug 6 to Oct 27, 1903)  
Syria Ottoman Ry Co (petn of Asia  
ld by the Official Receiver as  
Liquidator—s o from 12th August,  
1903—retained by Mr. Justice  
Byrne to go into Witness List)  
George F Milnes & Co ld (petn of  
John Lysaght ld—s o from Sept 23  
to Oct 27, 1903)  
Associated Mount Jackson Gold  
Mines (W A) ld (petn of T Dott—  
s o from Sept 30 to Oct 27, 1903)  
French Electric Lighting Boards  
ld (petn of Electric Lighting  
Boards ld and its receiver—s o  
from Oct 7 to Oct 27, 1903)  
Heath Insurance Corp ld (petn of  
E Guthrie and ors—s o from Oct  
14 to Oct 27, 1903)  
Automobile Supply Co ld (petn of  
Charles Hoare & Co)  
Dessole Electro Plating Co ld (petn  
of William Canning & Co)  
Agricultural Bread-Food Co ld  
(petn of H W F Mogg)  
Land & Water (1902) ld (petn of  
Spalding & Hodge ld)  
Bryndu and Port Talbot Collieries  
ld (petn of G F Dewdney)  
Elmore's Trust ld (petn of West  
Riding Union Banking Co)  
Garrucha Iron Mining Co ld (petn  
of Hickson & Moir)  
Household Gas Heater and Cooker  
(Patent) Co ld (petn of Inter-  
national Trade Exhibitions ld)  
Compass Trading Co ld (petn of B  
Dunkelsbuhler)  
Rand Roodepoort Gold Mining Co  
ld (petn of Frk McKenzie)  
Associated Financial Corp ld (petn  
of R A McCulloch)  
International Railway Co ld (petn  
of E C Arnold)  
Chancery Division.  
Petitions (for Reduction of Capital)  
under Companies Acts, 1867 & 1877.  
Spies' Petroleum Co ld and reduced  
(petn of Company—s o from 28th  
July to 27th October, 1903)  
Milwaukee and Chicago Breweries  
ld and reduced (petn of company  
—s o from 10th August to 27th  
October, 1903)  
Wienholt Estates Co of Australia ld  
and reduced (petn of company)  
Algraphy ld and reduced (petn of  
company)  
New Tamarugal Nitrate Co ld and  
reduced (petn of company)

Howell & James ld and reduced  
(petn of company)  
Silver Springs Bleaching and Dye-  
ing Co ld and reduced (petn of  
company)  
Petition under Companies (Memo-  
rial of Association) Act, 1890.  
Reuter's Telegram Co ld (petn of  
Company)  
Companies (Winding up).  
Motion.  
House & Co ld (for leave to issue  
writ of attachment)  
Court Summonses.  
Ibo Investment Trust ld (to vary  
certificate of taxation—retained  
by Mr. Justice Byrne)  
Jungle Syndicate ld (on claim of  
Angier—witnesses)  
Safety Explosives ld (for liberty to  
amend proof of debt)  
Same (for payment of purchase  
money)  
Coliseum and Coliseum Buildings  
and Offices Co, Leeds, ld (as to  
distribution of assets)  
Royal Aquarium and Summer and  
Winter Gardens Soc ld (as to dis-  
tribution of assets)  
Mewossoo (Taquah) Gold Mines ld  
(for production of books)  
Watchmakers' Alliance and Ernest  
Goode's Stores ld (on claims of  
J. David and anr)  
Beaconsfield Diamond Mining Co ld  
(for removal of Liquidator—w-  
nesses—appln of Beall)  
Same (Same—witnesses—appln of  
Crabbe)  
Same (for inspection of books, &c.  
—witnesses)  
Same (to expunge part of affidavits—  
witnesses)  
Guano and Oils Syndicate ld (for  
delivery up of books)  
Before Mr Justice JOYCE.  
Retained by Order.  
Causes for Trial (with Witnesses).  
Broad & Co ld v Roshier act (not  
before Nov 2)  
Great Torrington Commons Con-  
servators v Moore Stevens act  
pt hd (party to be added)  
Attorney-Gen v Andrew act pt hd  
(s o g—party to be added)  
Thompson v Lloyd's Bank act  
(s o g)  
Hurrell v Littlejohn act  
Causes for trial without Witnesses  
and Adjourned Summonses.  
Aguascutum ld v Moore & Scantle-  
bury adjd sums  
In re Drax Drax v Saville adjd  
sums (s o leave to amend)  
In re Banks' Trusts Denny v Banks  
adjd sums  
In re Leonfield Wyndham v  
Leonfield adjd sums  
In re Waterhouse Waterhouse v  
Fowler adjd sums  
Kynoch ld v Rowlands adjd notice  
and adjd sums  
Reffell v Met Rifle Range Co ld  
adjd sums pt hd (restored)  
In re Jobson Ladell v Jobson  
adjd sums  
In re Chartier Watkins v Ratcliff  
adjd sums  
Gair v Tolhurst two adjd sums  
Garner v Murray adjd sums  
In re Keith's Settlement Morgan v  
Keith adjd sums  
The National Provincial Bank of  
England and Saunders' Contract  
and V and P Act adjd sums  
In re Green Jennings v The Gran-  
mere Urban District Council  
adjd sums



and reduced  
ing and Dye  
duced (petn of  
Haynes Haynes v Haynes  
adjud sums  
re Banks' Estates Banks v  
Banks' adjs sums  
re Simonson Simonson v Pitt-  
adjs sums  
re Stubbs Plant v Bancroft  
adjs sums  
re Morris Morgan v Morris  
adjs sums  
re Williams Holder v Williams  
adjs sums  
re London Music Hall ld Richard  
v The Company adjs sums  
re Horobin Horobin v Horobin  
adjs sums  
re The Agency, Land and  
Finance Co of Australia ld  
Bouquet v The Agency, Land,  
Co. ld adjs sums  
re Crabtree Jennings v Priestley  
adjs sums  
re Steel adjs sums  
re Fowler, a Solr adjs sums  
re Whittles Whittles v Whittles  
adjs sums  
re Bowly Bowly v Bowly adjs  
adjs sums  
re Wood Bemrose v Yeomans  
adjs sums  
re Reichardt's Policy and Life  
Assce Co Acts adjs sums  
re Scott Scott v Scott adjs sums  
re Beechey act  
Further Considerations.  
re Fletcher Fletcher v Marsh  
fur con (s o not before Nov 12)  
re Atlas Assce Co ld fur con  
re Wm Bown ld Guthrie v Wm  
Bown ld 2nd fur con  
Sabbaby v Bedell fur con (short)

Before Mr. Justice SWINFEN EADY.  
Cases for Trial (with Witnesses).  
Piper v Stephens act  
Fenton and Art Fittings Co ld v  
Lord Chylesmore act  
re Deighton's Patent, No 15,670  
of 1896 petn ordered to go into  
Witness List  
re Morison's Patent, No 4,806,  
of 1890, &c petn ordered to go  
into Witness List  
Gold v Delap act (s o until return  
of Commission)  
Willoughby v Lord Middleton act  
Ashanti Gold Trust ld v Obbuaasi  
Syndicate ld act (set down by  
order)  
re Farbridge Farbridge v Far-  
bridge act  
Westwood v Taft act  
Peters v Goldsmid act  
Neave v Musmann act  
Pido v The Manufacturing and  
Trading Trustees ld act and  
motn for judgt (stayed until 10  
days after delivery of particulars  
and filing of affidavit, by order)  
Tucker v Hervey act and adjs  
sums (Hervey v Tucker)  
Carlish v Isaacs act  
Gould v The United Railways of  
the Havana and Regla Ware-  
houses ld act  
Bunner v Hyde act  
Mathias v Morgan Morgan v Grover  
act (consolidated)  
Hickley v Williams act

In re Cotterell Thomeycroft v  
Davies adjs sums (ordered to go  
into Witness List)  
Daniell v Wood act (Bristol D R)  
not before Nov 2  
Baldwin v Baker act  
Mules v Beavis act, counter-claim  
and m f j  
Gibbons v Rabinovitch act  
Slaters ld v Potter act  
Turnbull v Whitmore act  
In re Lord Swansea's Settled Estates  
and In re Settled Land Acts 1882  
to 1900 adjs sums entered in  
witness list by order  
Musgrave v Houldsworth act  
Boord & Son v Huddart act  
Shreeve v Shreeve act (Derby D R)  
Richardson v Ismay act  
Rawlinson v Johnson act  
Fair v Hyde act  
Prior v Tassell act  
The Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co ld  
v Moseley & Sons ld and ors  
Same v Moseley & Sons ld acts  
(consolidated)  
Day v Wheeler act  
In re Bourne Bourne v Bourne  
adjs sums (entered in witness  
list by order)  
The Koko Maricopas Co ld v  
Lounge act  
The Hackney Furnishing Co ld v  
Teller & Goldberg act  
Geipel v The Mayor, Aldermen and  
Citizens of Manchester act  
Price v Rees act  
Scrubb & Co v Brown's Ammonia  
Co ld act  
Taddy & Co v Sterious & Co act  
(restored)  
King v Santley act  
The N K Fairbank Co v The Cocos  
Butter Manufacturing Co act  
Singer v Brooke-Hitching act  
The British Mannesmann Tube Co  
ld v Phillips act  
Marshall v Venables act  
In re Campbell Atwood v Chap-  
man act  
In re Wallis Boney v Howard  
act and motn for judgt  
Bingemann v Davies act  
Sullivan v Sullivan act and  
counter-claim  
Osborne v Ward act and counter-  
claim  
In re Hawkins Hawkins v Haw-  
kins act  
Attorney-Gen v Hubbard act  
Berlinaki v Bernstein act  
Bruner v Moore act  
Weaver v The Sun Life Office and  
ors act  
Crisford v Hubbard act  
Weingarten v Rosenthal act  
Kerfoot v Abbey Effervescent Salt  
Co ld act  
Wendt v Fivey act  
Matthews v Bake act  
Evans v Gellyon Collieries ld act  
Menhinick, White, & Co v Beaumont  
act and counter-claim  
The London Property Investment  
Trust ld v Mayor, Aldermen, and  
Burgesses of Richmond act set  
down by order (pleadings to be  
delivered)  
Rayson v Little act

Tuesday, Master Lord Dunboyne.  
Wednesday, Master Macdonald.  
Thursday, Master Chitty.  
Friday, Master Day.  
Saturday, Master Archibald.

## The Property Mart.

Result of Sale.

Messrs. C. C. & T. Moore sold on Thursday last Freehold Ground-rents amounting to £285 per annum, secured on manufacturing premises at Stratford, for £8,000, and they obtained £3,250 for various properties at Mile End and Limehouse.

## Winding-up Notices.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, OCT. 16.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

BRITISH COLUMBIA FINANCIAL TRUST AND GENERAL CORPORATION, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 28, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Sydney George Cole, 11, Frederick's pl, Old Jewry. Davidson & Morris, Queen Victoria st, solors for liquidator

CITY OF LIVERPOOL PROPERTY INVESTMENT CORPORATION, LIMITED (IN LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 14, to send in their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Isaac Morris, 7, Victoria st, Liverpool

COMPASS TRADING CO, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented Oct 25, directed to be heard Oct 27. Thorp, Salisbury House, solor for petner. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Oct 25

D. JACOBS & SONS, LIMITED (IN VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before Oct 30, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Henry McLellan, Devonshire chmbrs, Bishopgate st Without

EBENEZER TIMMINS & SONS, LIMITED (IN VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION) Creditors are required, on or before Dec 8, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Herbert Elliott Eastwood, 19, Castle st, Liverpool. Burton & Wardle, Runcorn, solors for liquidator

GARRICK CLUB CO, LIMITED (IN LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before Dec 1, to send their names and addresses, together with full particulars of their debts or claims, to Peter Gregson, 57, Princess st, Manchester

INTERNATIONAL RAILWAY CORPORATION, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented Oct 13, directed to be heard Oct 27. Leggatt & Co, Raymond bldgs, Gray's inn, solors for petner. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Oct 25

LIVERPOOL ABNANTH GOLD CONCESSIONS, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Dec 31, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to W. E. Mounsey and T. S. Sheard, 18, Harrington st, Liverpool. Bateson & Co, solors for liquidators

TEES UNION SHIPPING CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 28, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to William Barclay Peat, 3, Lothbury. Ashurst & Co, Throgmorton av, solors for liquidator

TYNE STEAM SHIPPING CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 28, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to William Barclay Peat, 3, Lothbury. Ashurst & Co, Throgmorton av, solors for liquidator

WILLIAM MOORE, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 14, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to A. F. Dicken, 9 and 10, Pancras ln

COURTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER.

NEVIN BAY GRANITE QUARRY CO, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented Oct 13, directed to be heard at the Assize Courts, Manchester, Oct 26, at 10.30. Broadbent, Railway rd, Darwen, solors for petners. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 2 o'clock in the afternoon of Oct 24

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, OCT. 20.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

ADELPHI SYNDICATE, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 28, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Reginald H. Clemch, 50, Lime st

COLLEBRANDERS MATARELELAND DEVELOPMENT CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Dec 2, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to J. Durie Pattullo, 71, King William st. Vallance & Co, Lombard House, solors for liquidator

CONSOLIDATED BELLINGWELL DEVELOPMENT CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Dec 2, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to J. Durie Pattullo, 71, King William st. Vallance & Co, Lombard House, solors for liquidator

EDWARD BAKER & SONS, LIMITED (IN VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 23, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Henry Thomas Lidsam, 15 and 16, Waterloo st, Birmingham. Jaques & Sons, Birmingham, solors

EMPIRE PHOTOGRAPH CO, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented Oct 15, directed to be heard Nov 3. Goodale & Co, Essex st, Strand. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Nov 2

HOLTON CONSOLIDATED CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Dec 2, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to J. Durie Pattullo, 71, King William st. Vallance & Co, Lombard House, solors for liquidator

LONDON VALLEY GOLDFIELDS, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Dec 2, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to David Anderson, 20, Copthall av. Vallance & Co, Lombard House, solors for liquidator

MARSHOTT & PARKER, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Dec 1, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Thomas Galloway Mellers, 1, King John's chmbrs, Bridlesmith gate, Nottingham. Ashwell & Tutin, Nottingham, solors for liquidator

MOORLOST GOLDFIELDS, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Dec 2, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to David Anderson, 20, Copthall av. Vallance & Co, Lombard House, solors for liquidator

NELLY AND PIONEER REEPS GOLD MINING CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Dec 2, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to J. Durie Pattullo, 71, King William st. Vallance & Co, Lombard House, solors for liquidator

NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE WINE AND SPIRIT CO, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented Oct 16, directed to be heard Nov 3. Rynga, Chancery ln, for Maughan & Hall, Newcastle upon Tyne, solors for petner. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Nov 2

SABI (KHODESIA) GOLD MINING CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Dec 2, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to J. Durie Pattullo, 71, King William st. Vallance & Co, Lombard House, solors for liquidator

WOODEN, RICHARDSON, & CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Dec 1, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Charles Whewill, 1, Imperial arcade, New st, Huddersfield. Ramsden & Co, Huddersfield, solors for liquidator

## High Court of Justice.—King's Bench Division.

MASTERS IN CHAMBERS FOR MICHAELMAS SITTINGS, 1903.

A to F.—Mondays, Wednesdays, Fridays, Master Lord Dunboyne;  
Tuesdays, Thursdays, Saturdays, Master Day.

G to N.—Mondays, Wednesdays, Fridays, Master Chitty; Tuesdays,  
Thursdays, Saturdays, Master Macdonell.

O to Z.—Mondays, Wednesdays, Fridays, Master Archibald; Tuesdays,  
Thursdays, Saturdays, Master Wilberforce.

PRACTICE MASTER.

A master will sit daily in his own room in accordance with the following  
not to dispose of Questions of Practice, Ex parte Applications, and  
General Business:

Monday, Master Wilberforce.

## Bankruptcy Notices.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Oct. 16.

## RECEIVING ORDERS.

AREW, ALFRED, Luton, Straw Hat Manufacturer Luton Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13  
 BATTEN, THOMAS, and ALBERT EDWARD BATTEN, Aber-  
 tillery, Grocers Tredgar Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12  
 BAUER, GODFRED FREDERIC, Dudley, Gut Dresser Dudley  
 Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12  
 BOLT, JOHN, Sunderland, Publican Sunderland Pet Oct 2  
 Ord Oct 14  
 BROWN, WILLIAM ALFRED, Peckham, Grocer's Manager  
 High Court Pet Oct 14 Ord Oct 14  
 BURFORD, S and E, Bermondsey High Court Pet Sept 12  
 Ord Oct 13  
 CARTER, FREDERICK JAMES, Dublin, Clerk High Court  
 Pet Sept 14 Ord Oct 13  
 CHAMBERS, GEORGE, Sandgate, Penrith, Cumberland, Inn-  
 keeper Carlisle Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13  
 COLEMAN, GEORGE G, Milton next Sittingbourne, Kent,  
 Licensed Victualler Rochester Pet Sept 29 Ord Oct 12  
 DARBYSHIRE, WILLIAM HENRY, Bootle, Lancs, Clerk Liver-  
 pool Pet Sept 10 Ord Oct 13  
 DAVIES, JOHN, Wimbledon, Fancy Draper Kingston,  
 Surrey Pet Oct 6 Ord Oct 12  
 DEADMAN, SYDNEY JOSEPH, Wokingham, Cycle Agent  
 Reading Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 12  
 DIPSTALE, FREDERICK HENRY, Bowes Park, Clerk  
 Edmonton Ord Oct 10  
 DUFFIN, WILLIAM HENRY, Flusshdyke, Ossett Dewsbury  
 Pet Oct 14 Ord Oct 14  
 EATCH, MARSHALL BURDANES, Lincoln, Grocer Lincoln  
 Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13  
 ELLIS, JAMES, Charlton, Kent, Surveyor Greenwich Pet  
 Sept 17 Ord Oct 13  
 EVANS, ARTHUR JAMES, Dowlais, Glam, Greengrocer  
 Merthyr Tydfil Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13  
 EVANS, JOHN YOUNG, Swansea, House Decorator Swansea  
 Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12  
 EVERSON, HUTTY, Middlebrough, Coal Dealer Middle-  
 brough Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13  
 FARNSWORTH, WILLIAM, Derby, Hay Merchant Derby and  
 Long Eaton Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10  
 FULLER, GEORGE, Lower Caversham, Oxford, Painter  
 Reading Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 12  
 GAUNT, HARRY, Leeds, Grocer Leeds Pet Oct 10 Ord  
 Oct 10  
 GEORGE, THOMAS, Merthyr Vale, Glam, Labourer Merthyr  
 Tydfil Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12  
 GOLD, ANNIE, Windsor, Coachbuilder Windsor Pet Oct  
 12 Ord Oct 13  
 GRAY, JAMES, Scarborough, Tailor Scarborough Pet Oct  
 14 Ord Oct 14  
 GWILLIAM, EDWIN, Shrewsbury, General Dealer Shrews-  
 bury Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10  
 HALL, WILLIAM FREDERICK, Upper Parkstone, Dorset,  
 Outfitter Poole Pet Oct 14 Ord Oct 14  
 HILL, J. H., Sydenham, Kent, Grocer Greenwich Pet  
 Sept 18 Ord Oct 13  
 HITCHEN, JOHN STOTT, Sowerby Bridge, nr Halifax,  
 Dyer's Labourer Halifax Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13  
 HOBBS, WILLIAM BARTON, Portsmouth, Business Transfer  
 Agent Portsmouth Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12  
 HOLMES, GEORGE ARTHUR, Castle Donington, Leicester  
 Managing Director Leicester Pet Sept 29 Ord Oct 12  
 JONES, HERBERT, Shrewsbury, Nurseryman Shrewsbury  
 Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13  
 KEMPSTON, ALBERT EDWARD, Leicester, Cycle Agent  
 Leicester Pet Sept 28 Ord Oct 12  
 LAWSON, CAROLINE SARAH, Hove, Lodging house Keeper  
 Brighton Pet Sept 23 Ord Oct 12  
 LONGMAN, SAMUEL HURMAN, Aberdare, Chemist Aberdare  
 Pet Oct 14 Ord Oct 14  
 LOWE, LEVI, and ALBERT HENRY LOWE, Wollerton, nr  
 Market Drayton, Salop, Brick Manufacturers Crews  
 Pet Sept 23 Ord Oct 12  
 MACINTOSH, ELIZABETH, Huddersfield, Glove, Licensed  
 Victualler Gloucester Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12  
 MALONE, JOHN, Bradford, Manchester, Grocer Manchester  
 Pet Oct 8 Ord Oct 14  
 MASON, JAMES STREED, Pudsey, Yorks, Tailor Bradford Pet  
 Oct 13 Ord Oct 13  
 MATTHEW, JOHN WILLIAM, Nantwich, Cabinet Maker Crews  
 Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13  
 MELLOR, JOE, Hove, nr Huddersfield, Plumber Leeds  
 Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12  
 MELSON, HENRY, King's Heath, Worcester Birmingham  
 Pet Sept 25 Ord Oct 12  
 METCALF, THOMAS, Clebury, Yorks, Farmer Stockton on  
 Tees Pet Sept 28 Ord Oct 13  
 MORAN, DANIEL, Pontardulais, Glam, Tailor Swansea  
 Pet Sept 16 Ord Oct 13  
 PARKINSON, WILLIAM, Hemingbrough, nr Howden, Yorks,  
 Farmer Kingston upon Hull Pet Oct 14 Ord Oct 14  
 REEVE, FREDERICK, South Norwood, Marble Merchant  
 High Court Pet Oct 15 Ord Oct 15  
 ROBSON, EDWARD, Newbiggin by the Sea, Northumberland,  
 Commercial Traveller Newcastle on Tyne Pet Oct 12  
 Ord Oct 12  
 SAWTELL, JOSEPH ANTHONY and ROBERT SYDNEY SAWTELL,  
 Gwelohe, Mon, Farmers Newport, Mon Pet Oct 12  
 Ord Oct 12  
 SKYRME, JOHN, Kingston, Hereford, Grocer Leominster  
 Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12  
 SPARROW, THOMAS, Kingston upon Hull, Cab Driver Kingston  
 upon Hull Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13  
 SPITTLEHOUSE, GEORGE WALTER, Sheffield, Butcher  
 Sheffield Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13  
 STRICKER, WILLIAM A, Hove, Sussex, Builder Brighton  
 Pet Oct 14 Ord Oct 14  
 SWARBRICK, ALFRED, Sunderland, Sunderland Pet Oct 10  
 Ord Oct 10  
 TAYLOR, RICHARD B Skirbeck, nr Boston, Farmer Boston  
 Pet Oct 1 Ord Oct 14  
 THOMPSON, WALTER HENRY, Gt Yarmouth, Baker Gt Yar-  
 mouth Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13

TWIGG, WILLIAM JAMES, West Dulwich, Surrey, Farmer  
 Kingston, Surrey Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12  
 WICKENED, EDWARD JAMES, Wood Green, Accountant  
 Edmonton Pet Sept 16 Ord Oct 12  
 WILSON, CHRISTOPHER ARTHUR, Birmingham, Tailor  
 Birmingham Pet Sept 24 Ord Oct 13  
**FIRST MEETINGS.**  
 ARCHER, BENTLEY G, Northall, Bucks, Farmer Oct 29 at  
 11 Court House, Luton  
 BARKFORTH, HENRY ARMITAGE, Halifax, Tanner Oct 28 at  
 3 Off Rec, Townhall chambers, Halifax  
 BELL, ALFRED, Kingston upon Hull, Builder Oct 24 at 11  
 Off Rec, Trinity House, Hull  
 BRAMALL, JAMES HENRY, Woodley, Cheshire, Grocer Oct  
 29 at 11.15 Off Rec, County chambers, Market pl, Stock-  
 port  
 BURFORD, S and E, Drummond rd, Bermondsey Oct 27 at 1  
 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st  
 CARTER, FREDERICK JAMES, Dublin, Clerk Oct 26 at 1  
 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st  
 CHAMBERS, GEORGE, Sandgate, Penrith, Cumberland, Inn-  
 keeper Oct 28 at 12.30 Off Rec, 34, Fisher st, Carlisle  
 CLARKE, JOHN THOMAS, Norwich, Farmer Oct 24 at 1  
 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich  
 COLEMAN, GEORGE G, Milton next Sittingbourne, Kent  
 Licensed Victualler Oct 28 at 12.15 115, High st,  
 Rochester  
 COTTERILL, HERBERT, Bradley Green, Biddulph, Staffs,  
 Grocer Oct 27 at 10.45 Off Rec, 23, King Edward st,  
 Macclesfield  
 DEXTER, JOHN MORRELL, Beeston, Notts, Lace Manufac-  
 turer Oct 26 at 12.30 Off Rec, 4, Castle pl, Park st  
 FARREY, ABEL, Heaton Norris, Lancs, Carrier Oct 29 at  
 10.45 Off Rec, County chambers, Market pl, Stockport  
 FOSKETT, LEONARD HARRERT, Brighton, Playwright Oct  
 27 at 11.30 24, Railway app, London Bridge  
 FRENCH, JAMES HARTLEY, Beckenham, Schoolmaster Oct  
 26 at 12.30 24, Railway app, London Bridge  
 GAUNT, HARRY, Leeds, Grocer Oct 26 at 11 Off Rec, 22,  
 Park row, Leeds  
 GLOVER, EDWARD, Darlington, Staffs, Haulier Oct 27 at 11  
 Off Rec, Wolverhampton  
 GREEN, WILLIAM THOMAS OSWALD, Shrewsbury, nr Man-  
 chester Plumber Oct 26 at 2.50 Off Rec, Byrom st,  
 Manchester  
 GREENE, WILLIAM FRISKE, Dovercourt, Essex, Inventor  
 Oct 27 at 11 Great Eastern Hotel, Liverpool st  
 GWILLIAM, EDWIN, Shrewsbury, General Dealer Oct 26 at 2  
 Off Rec, 42, St John's hill, Shrewsbury  
 HALL, THOMAS JOSEPH, Stourbridge, Worcester, Hosier  
 Oct 24 at 11 Off Rec, 199, Wolverhampton st, Dudley  
 HARRIS, WILLIAM BUSHELL, Llawhaden, Pembroke,  
 Licensed Victualler Oct 24 at 11 Off Rec, 4, Queen st,  
 Cardarthen  
 HAYNES, JOHN PARKER, Tettenhall, Staffs, Painter Oct 27  
 at 12 Off Rec, Wolverhampton  
 HIGGS & CO, H A, St Pancras, Coal Merchants Oct 28 at 11  
 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st  
 HOBBS, WILLIAM BARTON, Stamshaw, Portsmouth,  
 Business Transfer Agent Oct 27 at 3 Off Rec, Cam-  
 bridge June, High st, Portsmouth  
 HOBST, JOHN, Oldham, Innkeeper Oct 27 at 12 Off Rec,  
 Groves st, Oldham  
 JENKINS, AMOS, Southwell, Notts, Builder Oct 26 at 12  
 Off Rec, 4, Castle pl, Park st, Nottingham  
 JONES, HERBERT, Shrewsbury, Seedman Oct 27 at 2  
 Lower Room Music Hall, Market st, Shrewsbury  
 KEMPSTON, ALBERT EDWARD, Leicester, Cycle Agent Oct  
 26 at 12 Off Rec, 1, Berridge st, Leicester  
 LAWSON, CAROLINE SARAH, Hove, Sussex, Lodging House  
 Keeper Oct 29 at 11.30 Off Rec, 4, Pavilion bldgs,  
 Brighton  
 LEES, JAMES HENRY ANTHONY MAURICE, Leyton, Essex,  
 Butcher Oct 26 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st  
 MALONE, JOHN, Bradford, Manchester, Grocer Oct 26 at 3  
 3.30 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester  
 MASON, JAMES STREED, Pudsey, Yorks, Tailor Oct 27 at 3  
 Off Rec, 28, Tytlst rd, Bradford  
 MELLOR, JOE, Leeds, Plumber Oct 26 at 11.30 Off Rec,  
 22, Park row, Leeds  
 MIDDLETON, GUY, Clapham, Mineral Waters Manufacturer  
 Oct 27 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st  
 MOYSE, WILLIAM JAMES, Plymouth, General Dealer Oct  
 26 at 11 Off Rec, 6, Athenaeum ter, Plymouth  
 ODDY, JOHN, Adwalton, Yorks, Farmer Oct 26 at 3 Off  
 Rec, 28, Tytlst rd, Bradford  
 OLMS, HERMAN, Blythe rd, West Kensington, Tailor Oct  
 26 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st  
 PEAKE, WILLIAM DANIEL, Tunstall, Stafford, Crate Maker  
 Oct 26 at 11.30 Off Rec, Newcastle under Lyme  
 PRINCE, A WOODHOUSE, Finsbury circus Oct 28 at 12  
 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st  
 PLATT, WILLIAM HENRY, Oldham Oct 27 at 11 Off Rec,  
 Groves st, Oldham  
 REEVE, FREDERICK, South Norwood, Marble Merchant  
 Oct 26 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st  
 SANDERSON, WILLIAM HENRY, Nottingham, Butcher Oct  
 26 at 11.30 Off Rec, 4, Castle pl, Park st, Nottingham  
 SCOTCHER, ALFRED, Pevensy, Sussex, Baker Oct 27 at 2  
 Messrs Coles & Sons, Seaside rd, Eastbourne  
 TATE, ARTHUR, THOMAS CLIFTON, jun, JAMES RUTHERFORD,  
 Newcastle upon Tyne, Shipowners Oct 26 at 11.30 Off  
 Rec, 30, Mosley st, Newcastle on Tyne  
 TEBBAGHAWAN, WILLIAM, St Austell, Cornwall, Hairdresser  
 Oct 26 at 12 Off Rec, 2, Rossmore st, Truro  
 TREVELYAN, THOMAS JOHN, Brynmeryn, nr Bridgend, Collier  
 Oct 29 at 12.15 117, St Mary st, Cardiff  
 WADSWORTH, JOHN, Salford Oct 26 at 3 Off Rec, Byrom  
 st, Manchester  
 WILKINS, TOPHIS, Hugglescote, Leicester, Fireman Oct 24  
 11.30 Off Rec, 47, Full st, Derby  
 WOOD, JOHN, Penrith, Florist Oct 28 at 12 Off Rec, 34,  
 Fisher st, Carlisle

## ADJUDICATIONS.

AREW, ALFRED, Luton, Straw Hat Manufacturer Luton  
 Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13  
 BATTEN, THOMAS, and ALBERT EDWARD BATTEN, Aber-  
 tillery, Mon, Grocers Tredgar Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12  
 BAUER, GODFRED FREDERIC, Dudley, Gut Dresser Dudley  
 Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12

BRADLEY, RICHARD PARKINSON, Huddersfield, Draughtsman  
 Huddersfield Pet Sept 28 Ord Oct 14  
 BROWN, WILLIAM ALFRED, Peckham, Grocer's Manager  
 High Court Pet Oct 14 Ord Oct 14  
 CHAMBERS, GEORGE, Sandgate, Penrith, Cumberland, Inn-  
 keeper Carlisle Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13  
 COLEMAN, GEORGE G, Milton next Sittingbourne, Kent,  
 Licensed Victualler Rochester Pet Sept 29 Ord Oct 12  
 DARBYSHIRE, WILLIAM HENRY, Bootle, Lancs, Clerk  
 Liverpool Pet Sept 10 Ord Oct 13  
 DEADMAN, SYDNEY JOSEPH, Wokingham, Cycle Agent  
 Reading Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 12  
 DUFFIN, WILLIAM HENRY, Flusshdyke, Ossett Dewsbury  
 Pet Oct 14 Ord Oct 14  
 EATCH, MARSHALL BURDANES, Lincoln, Grocer Lincoln  
 Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13  
 EVANS, ARTHUR JAMES, Dowlais, Glam, Greengrocer  
 Merthyr Tydfil Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13  
 EVANS, JOHN YOUNG, Swansea, House Decorator Swansea  
 Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12  
 EVERSON, HUTTY, Middlebrough, Coal Dealer Middle-  
 brough Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13  
 FARNSWORTH, WILLIAM, Derby, Hay Merchant Derby and  
 Long Eaton Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10  
 FULLER, GEORGE, Lower Caversham, Oxford, Painter  
 Reading Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 12  
 GAUNT, HARRY, Leeds, Grocer Leeds Pet Oct 10 Ord  
 Oct 10  
 GEORGE, THOMAS, Merthyr Vale Labourer Merthyr Tydfil  
 Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12  
 GODWIN, LEONARD GEORGE, Tipton Bath Pet Sept 23  
 Ord Oct 12  
 GOLD, ANNIE, Windsor, Coachbuilder Windsor Pet Oct  
 12 Ord Oct 13  
 GRAY, JAMES, Scarborough, Tailor Scarborough Pet Oct  
 14 Ord Oct 14  
 HALL, WILLIAM FREDERICK, Upper Parkstone, Dorset, Out-  
 fitter Poole Pet Oct 14 Ord Oct 14  
 HITCHEN, JOHN STOTT, Sowerby Bridge, nr Halifax, Dyer's  
 Labourer Halifax Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13  
 HOBBS, WILLIAM BARTON, Portsmouth, Business Transfer  
 Agent Portsmouth Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12  
 HOBBS, WILLIAM, Bristol, Haulier Bristol Pet Oct 5 Ord  
 Oct 14  
 KEMPSTON, ALBERT EDWARD, Leicester, Cycle Agent  
 Leicester Pet Sept 28 Ord Oct 12  
 LAWSON, CAROLINE SARAH, Hove, Sussex, Lodging house  
 Keeper Brighton Pet Sept 23 Ord Oct 12  
 LEES, JAMES HENRY ANTHONY MAURICE, Leyton, Essex,  
 Butcher High Court Pet Sept 9 Ord Oct 12  
 LONGMAN, SAMUEL HURMAN, Aberdare, Chemist Aberdare  
 Pet Oct 14 Ord Oct 14  
 MACINTOSH, ELIZABETH, Huddersfield, Glove, Licensed  
 Victualler Gloucester Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12  
 MALONE, JOHN, Bradford, Manchester, Grocer Manchester  
 Pet Oct 8 Ord Oct 14  
 MASON, JAMES STREED, Pudsey, Yorks, Tailor Bradford  
 Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13  
 MATTHEW, JOHN WILLIAM, Nantwich, Cabinet Maker Crews  
 Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13  
 MAUGHAN, JOHN, Seaton Sluice, Northumberland, Builder  
 Newcastle on Tyne Pet Sept 23 Ord Oct 13  
 MELLOR, JOE, Hove, nr Huddersfield, Plumber Leeds  
 Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12  
 MORAN, DANIEL, Pontardulais, Glam, Tailor Swansea  
 Pet Sept 16 Ord Oct 13  
 PARKINSON, WILLIAM, Hemingbrough, nr Howden, Yorks,  
 Farmer Kingston upon Hull Pet Oct 14 Ord Oct 14  
 ROBSON, EDWARD, Newbiggin by the Sea, Northumberland,  
 Commercial Traveller Newcastle on Tyne Pet Oct 12  
 Ord Oct 12  
 SAWTELL, JOSEPH ANTHONY, and ROBERT SYDNEY SAWTELL,  
 Gwelohe, Mon, Farmers Newport, Mon Pet Oct 12  
 Ord Oct 12  
 SCHENUTZ, KARL ROBERT, Brixton High Court Pet Sept 9  
 Ord Oct 12  
 SINGER, JACOB, Colonial av, Minorities, Exporter of Furs  
 High Court Pet Sept 17 Ord Oct 13  
 SKYRME, JOHN, Kingston, Hereford, Grocer Leominster  
 Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12  
 SPARROW, THOMAS, Kingston upon Hull, Cab Driver Kingston  
 upon Hull Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13  
 SPITTLEHOUSE, GEORGE WALTER, Sheffield, Wholesale  
 Butcher Sheffield Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13  
 SWARBRICK, ALFRED, Sunderland, Sunderland Pet Oct 10  
 Ord Oct 10  
 THOMPSON, WALTER HENRY, Gt Yarmouth, Baker Gt  
 Yarmouth Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13  
 WALKER, ALFRED SMITH, and HANS SLOAN, Newcastle on  
 Tyne, Plumbers Newcastle on Tyne Pet Sept 15 Ord  
 Oct 12  
 WILKINSON, ERNEST ADAM, Leadenhall st, Coal Merchant  
 High Court Pet Sept 8 Ord Oct 13  
 WILLIAMS, WILLIAM MORRIS, Crayke Park rd, Harlesden,  
 Draper High Court Pet Sept 18 Ord Oct 13

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Oct. 20.

## RECEIVING ORDERS.

ASHTON, ARTHUR CHARLES, Peckham Park rd, General  
 Salesman High Court Pet Oct 15 Ord Oct 16  
 BAILEY, SAM BILLING RIDGDALE, Knaresborough, Green-  
 grocer York Pet Oct 14 Ord Oct 14  
 BAKER, RONALD CARE, Bexhill, Auctioneer's Clerk Hastings  
 Pet Oct 16 Ord Oct 16  
 BAMBERGER, JULIUS CHARLTON, Harrogate York Pet  
 Oct 16 Ord Oct 16  
 BARKER, FREDERICK, Quinton, Worcester, Butcher Bir-  
 mingham Pet Oct 17 Ord Oct 17  
 CLAXTON, HARRY, Cromer, Carpenter Norwich Pet Oct 15  
 Ord Oct 15  
 DACE, JOHN HENRY, Leigh, Staffs, Former Burton on Trent  
 Pet Oct 16 Ord Oct 16  
 DELAFORCE, EDWARD JAMES, Portland pl, Job Master  
 High Court Pet Oct 17 Ord Oct 17  
 DOUGLAS, JOHN WILLIAM, Matlock, Derby, Hosiery Works  
 Employed Derby Pet Oct 2 Ord Oct 10  
 EASTON, JAMES, Melton, Suffolk, Wine Merchant Ipswich  
 Pet Oct 17 Ord Oct 17



**EASTWOOD, JOHN THOMAS**, Brierfield, Lancs, Cycle Agent  
Barley Pet Oct 17 Ord Oct 17  
**FRANCIS, JOHN**, Cardiff, Boot Dealer Cardiff Pet Sept 28  
Ord Oct 18  
**GENT, CLIFFORD THOMAS**, Aller, Somerset, Farmer Yeovil  
Pet Sept 12 Ord Oct 16  
**HARDISTY, JOSEPH**, Harrogate, Farm Labourer York Pet  
Oct 17 Ord Oct 17  
**HARRIS, EDITH ADELA**, Elm pl, 8 Kensington, Unmarried  
High Court Pet Oct 15 Ord Oct 16  
**HAYTER, HARRY VINCENT**, Dorchester, Confectioner  
Dorchester Pet Oct 16 Ord Oct 16  
**HILLIER, ALBERT**, Neath, Hawker Aberavon Pet Oct 16  
Ord Oct 16  
**HILLMAN, EDWARD**, Laidon, Essex, Cartman Chelmsford  
Pet Oct 15 Ord Oct 15  
**HOWIE, PERCY**, Gt Yarmouth, Cycle Maker Gt Yarmouth  
Pet Oct 15 Ord Oct 15  
**LANGLEY, JAMES BUCHANAN**, Malvern, Furniture Dealer  
Worcester Pet Oct 16 Ord Oct 16  
**LEVETT, CHARLES FREDERICK**, Ipswich, Timber Merchant  
Ipswich Pet Oct 17 Ord Oct 17  
**LOWRY, CHARLES**, and **WILLIAM HANDSFORD PAINE**, Dart-  
ford, Builders Rochester Pet Oct 16 Ord Oct 16  
**MARTIN, ARTHUR WATSON**, Nottingham Nottingham Pet  
Oct 17 Ord Oct 17  
**MULOVITCH and BROWN**, Leeds, Clothiers Leeds Pet Sept 30  
Ord Oct 16  
**OWY, JOHN**, Adwalton, Yorks, Farmer Bradford Pet  
Sept 29 Ord 15  
**PETERS, RICHARD ROBERT**, Gt Grimsby, Fisherman Gt  
Grimsby Pet Oct 16 Ord Oct 16  
**PLEASANTS, BENJAMIN**, Norwich, Draper Norwich Pet  
Oct 15 Ord Oct 17  
**PRICE, DAVID WILLIAM**, Penterbach, Merthyr Tydfil, Collier  
Merthyr Tydfil Pet Oct 16 Ord Oct 16  
**READHEAD, CHARLES LINWOOD**, Beccles, Suffolk, Cycle  
Manufacturer Gt Yarmouth Ord Sept 28 Ord Oct 17  
**REIDMANS, BENJAMIN**, Llandilo, Carmarthen, Butcher  
Carmarthen Pet Oct 17 Ord Oct 17  
**ROBERTS, JOHN HENRY**, Aldridge, Staffs, Harness Manu-  
facturer Walsall Pet Oct 15 Ord Oct 15  
**SCHWICK, JAMES**, New Clothorpes, Baker Gt Grimsby  
Pet Oct 14 Ord Oct 14  
**SHREY, SPENCER**, Bexhill on Sea, Chemist Hastings Pet  
Oct 16 Ord Oct 16  
**THOMSON, THOMAS**, Wolverhampton, Traveller Wolver-  
hampton Pet Oct 15 Ord Oct 15  
**WILLIS, ANNE**, Seething in, Middlesex, Flour Broker High  
Court Pet Sept 11 Ord Oct 15  
**WHELAN, GEORGE**, Halifax, Tailor Halifax Pet Oct 17  
Ord Oct 17  
Amended notice substituted for that published in the  
London Gazette of Oct 6:  
**JACOBSON, SARAH**, Newcastle on Tyne, Tailor, Newcastle on  
Tyne Pet Oct 3 Ord Oct 3  
**FIRST MEETINGS.**  
**AKES, EDWARD**, Birmingham, Timber Merchant Oct 29 at  
11 174, Corporation st, Birmingham

**ASHTON, ARTHUR CHARLES**, Peckham Park rd, General  
Salesman Oct 30 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st  
**ASKEW, ALFRED**, Luton, Straw Hat Manufacturer Oct 29  
at 10.30 Court House, Luton  
**BAILEY, SAM BILLING RIBSDALE**, Knaresborough, Green-  
grocer Oct 29 at 2.30 Off Rec, The Red House, Dun-  
combe pl, York  
**BAKER, RONALD CARR**, Bexhill, Auctioneer's Clerk Oct 29  
at 11.30 County Court Office, 24, Cambridge rd,  
Hastings  
**BANDREGER, JULIUS CHARLTON**, Harrogate Oct 29 at 2.30  
Off Rec, The Red House, Duncombe pl, York  
**BOURNE, FREDERICK JAMES**, Wolverhampton, Grocer Oct  
28 at 10 Off Rec, Wolverhampton  
**BROWN, WILLIAM ALFRED**, Peckham, Grocer's Manager  
Oct 29 at 1 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st  
**BURNAND, E PAUL**, Worthing Nov 12 at 10.30 Off Rec, 4,  
Pavilion bldgs, Brighton  
**CLARIDGE, GEORGE D**, Birmingham, Auctioneer Oct 29 at  
12 174, Corporation st, Birmingham  
**DARBYSHIRE, WILLIAM HENRY**, Boodle, Lancs, Clerk Oct 28  
at 12 Off Rec, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool  
**DELAPOUR, EDWARD JAMES**, Portland pl, Jobmaster Oct 30  
at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st  
**DUFFIN, WILLIAM HENRY**, Oasett Oct 29 at 10.30 Off Rec,  
Bank chmbrs, Corporation st, Dewsbury  
**EASTON, JAMES**, Woodbridge, Suffolk, Wine Merchant Oct  
29 at 2 Off Rec, 38, Princes st, Ipswich  
**ELLIS, RICHARD**, Kingston upon Hull, Cycle Maker Oct 28  
at 11.30 Off Rec, Trinity House ln, Hull  
**EVANS, ARTHUR JAMES**, Dowla, Glam, Greengrocer Oct  
29 at 12 155, High st, Merthyr Tydfil  
**EVANS, JOHN YOUNG**, Swansea, House Decorator Oct 30 at  
12 Off Rec, 31, Alexandra rd, Swansea  
**EVERSON, HUTTY**, Middlesbrough, Coal Dealer Oct 30 at 3  
Off Rec, 8, Albert rd, Middlesbrough  
**FAIRSWORTH, WILLIAM**, Derby, Hay Merchant Oct 28 at  
11 Off Rec, 47, Full st, Derby  
**GEORGE, THOMAS**, Merthyr Vale, Glam, Labourer Oct 28  
at 12 135, High st, Merthyr Tydfil  
**GRAHAM, ROBERT**, Blackburn, Clerk Oct 28 at 11 Off Rec,  
14, Chapel st, Preston  
**GRAY, JAMES**, Scarborough, Tailor Oct 29 at 11.30 74,  
Newborough, Scarborough  
**HADDLESEY, CHARLES ROBERT**, SAMUEL FITZWILLIAM  
HADDLESEY, Caistor, Solicitors Oct 28 at 11 Off Rec,  
15, Osborne st, Gt Grimsby  
**HARDISTY, JOSEPH**, Harrogate, Farm Labourer Nov 2 at 12.15  
Off Rec, The Red House, Duncombe place, York  
**HAUGHTON, EDWARD**, Burnley, Tripe Dresser Oct 30 at  
11.30 Court house, Burnley  
**HITCHES, JOHN STOTT**, Sowerby Bridge, nr Halifax, Dyer's  
Labourer Oct 28 at 3.45 Off Rec, Townhall chmbrs,  
Halifax  
**HOWIE, PERCY**, Gt Yarmouth, Cycle Maker Oct 30 at 1  
Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich  
**LILLEY, WALTER**, Skegness, Lincs, Plumber Nov 5 at 12.30  
Off Rec, 4 and 6, West st, Boston

**LOWE, LEVI**, and **ALBERT HENRY LOWE**, Wallerton, nr  
Market Drayton, Salop, Brick Manufacturers Oct 30  
at 10.45 Royal Hotel, Crewe  
**MACKINTOSH, ELIZABETH**, Licensed Victualler Oct 31 at 12  
Off Rec, Station rd, Gloucester  
**MATTHEE, JOHN WILLIAM**, Nantwich, Cheshire, Cabinet  
Maker Oct 30 at 11 Royal Hotel, Crewe  
**MORLEY, WILLIAM**, Spilsby, Lincs Nov 5 at 12 Off Rec, 4,  
and 6, West st, Boston  
**MULOVITCH and BROWN**, Leeds, Clothiers Oct 28 at 11 Off  
Rec, 22, Park row, Leeds  
**PARKINSON, WILLIAM**, Hemingbrough, nr Howden, Farmer  
Oct 28 at 12 Off Rec, Trinity House ln, Hull  
**ROBINSON, ROBERT IRVING**, Ulverston, Wine Merchant Oct  
28 at 11.30 Off Rec, 16, Cornwallist, Barrow in Furness  
**ROBSON, EDWARD**, Newbiggin by the Sea, Northumberland,  
Commercial Traveller Oct 28 at 11.30 Off Rec, 30,  
Mosley st, Newcastle on Tyne  
**SKYERS, JOHN**, Kingston, Hereford, Grocer Oct 28 at 3 Off  
Rec, Hereford  
**SPARROW, THOMAS**, Kingston upon Hull Cab Driver Oct 28  
at 11 Off Rec, Trinity House ln, Hull  
**STREET, SPENCER**, Bexhill on Sea, Chemist Oct 29 at 12  
County Court Office, 24, Cambridge rd, Hastings  
**STRINGS, WILLIAM**, Hove, Builder Oct 29 at 10.45 Off  
Rec, 4, Pavilion bldgs, Brighton  
**TAYLOR, FRANK**, Birmingham, Printer Oct 28 at 11 174,  
Corporation st, Birmingham  
**TENNENT, WILLIAM**, New shildon, Durham, Boot Dealer  
Oct 29 at 3 Wear Valley Hotel, Bishop's Auck-  
land  
**THOMPSON, WALTER HENRY**, Great Yarmouth, Baker  
Oct 31 at 12.30 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich  
**TWIGG, WILLIAM JAMES**, West Dulwich, Farmer Oct 30 at  
11.30 24, Railway app, London Bridge  
**WALBOURN, THOMAS JAMES**, and **THOMAS GEORGE JONES**,  
Birmingham, Hairdressers Oct 28 at 12 174, Corpora-  
tion st, Birmingham  
**WALLIS, ANNE**, Seething in, Flour Broker Oct 29 at 12  
Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st  
**WEDGE, EROCH**, Willenhall, Staffs, Galvanizer Oct 23 at  
10.30 Off Rec, Wolverhampton  
**WILSON, CHRISTOPHER ARTHUR**, Birmingham, Tailor Nov 2  
at 11 174, Corporation st, Birmingham

## ADJUDICATIONS.

**ASHTON, ARTHUR CHARLES**, Peckham Park rd, General  
Salesman High Court Pet Oct 15 Ord Oct 16  
**BAILEY, SAM BILLING RIBSDALE**, Knaresborough, Green-  
grocer York Pet Oct 14 Ord Oct 14  
**BAKER, RONALD CARR**, Bexhill, Clerk Hastings Pet Oct  
16 Ord Oct 16  
**BANDREGER, JULIUS CHARLTON**, Harrogate York Pet Oct  
16 Ord Oct 16  
**BOLT, JOHN**, Sunderland, Publican Sunderland Pet Oct 2  
Ord Oct 16  
**BURNAND, E PAUL**, Worthing Brighton Pet July 27 Ord  
Oct 16

**READY 31st OCTOBER.**  
**80th Year of Publication.**

**THE**  
**SOLICITORS' DIARY,**  
**ALMANAC,**  
**LEGAL DIGEST, & DIRECTORY**  
**FOR**  
**1904.**

This old-established and important  
Annual is now universally recognized  
as the most useful

**LEGAL AND COMPREHENSIVE DIARY**  
ever published.

**Prices, 3s. 6d., 5s., 6s., & 8s. 6d.**  
According to Diary Space and Binding; and in the 5s., 6s.,  
and 8s. 6d. Editions there will be the additional features  
of a PAGED DIARY and an INDEX to same, and the  
5s. 6d. Edition is now arranged with each day's Diary com-  
mencing on the left-hand side of the opening.

**WATERLOW & SONS,**  
**LIMITED,**  
**LONDON WALL, LONDON.**

**BUTTERWORTH & CO.,**  
**LAW PUBLISHERS, 12, BELL YARD, LONDON, W.C.**

**READY ON MONDAY.** Price 20s. net; postage 7d.  
A Special Thin Edition with rounded edges at the same price

**THE**  
**YEARLY**  
**PRACTICE**  
**1904.**

Muir Mackenzie, Willes Chitty, Lushington,  
and Fox.

BUTTERWORTH & Co., 12, Bell Yard, Temple Bar, W.C.

**REEVES & TURNER,**  
**LAW BOOKSELLERS AND PUBLISHERS.**

*Libraries Valued or Purchased.*  
A Large Stock of Second-hand Reports and Text-books  
always on Sale.

**3, Bream's Buildings, Chancery Lane, E.C.,**  
FORMERLY OF 100, CHANCERY LANE AND GAREY STREET.

**JUST PUBLISHED, Price 10s. 6d.**  
**SIMONSON ON RECONSTRUCTION AND**  
**AMALGAMATION OF COMPANIES.**  
**WITH FORMS AND PRECEDENTS.**  
EFFINGHAM WILSON, 11, ROYAL EXCHANGE, E.C.

**READY 31st OCTOBER.**

**LEGAL DIARY,**  
**ALMANAC,**  
**AND**  
**COMPLETE LEGAL DIRECTORY**  
**FOR**  
**1904.**

Recognized everywhere as the  
Best and Most Comprehensive

**Diary for Solicitors**  
**and Barristers.**

**Prices: 3s. 6d., 5s., 6s., and 8s. 6d.,**  
according to Diary Space.

**Waterlow Bros. & Layton,**  
**LIMITED,**  
**24 & 25, BIRCHIN LANE, E.C.**

CLAXTON, HARRY, Cromer, Carpenter Norwich Pet Oct 15  
Ord Oct 15  
CRAYEN, HORACE, Morley, Yorks, Cloth Merchant Dewsbury Pet Sept 19 Ord Oct 17  
DACE, JOHN HENRY, Leigh, Staffs, Farmer, Burton-on-Trent Pet Oct 16 Ord Oct 16  
DAY, ARTHUR GEORGE FITZ ROY, Devonport, Captain Guildford Pet June 30 Ord Oct 16  
DELAFORE, EDWARD JAMES, Portland pl, Jobmaster High Court Pet Oct 17 Ord Oct 17  
DIPSTALE, FREDERICK HENRY, Bowes Park, Clerk Edmon-ton Ord Oct 16  
EASTWOOD, JOHN THOMAS, Brierfield, Lancs, Cycle Agent Burnley Pet Oct 17 Ord Oct 17  
EWART, RICHARD, South Shields, Fish Curer's Assistant Newcastle-on-Tyne Pet Oct 3 Ord Oct 15  
HARDISTY, JOSEPH, Harrogate, Farm Labourer York Pet Oct 17 Ord Oct 17  
HARRIS, EDITH ADELA, Elm pl, South Kensington High Court Pet Oct 15 Ord Oct 16  
HEATHER, HARRY VINCENT, Dorchester, Confectioner Dorchester Pet Oct 16 Ord Oct 16  
HILLIER, ALBERT, Neath, Glam, Hawker Aberystwy Pet Oct 16 Ord Oct 16  
HILLMAN, EDWARD, Laindon, Essex, Carman Chelmsford Pet Oct 15 Ord Oct 15

LANGLEY, JAMES BUCHANAN, Malvern, Worcester, Furniture Dealer Worcester Pet Oct 16 Ord Oct 16  
LOWE, LEVI, and ALBERT HENRY LOWE, Wollerton, nr Market Drayton, Brick Manufacturers Crewe Pet Sept 28 Ord Oct 17  
LUMLEY, CHARLES, and WILLIAM HANDSFORD FAIRB, Dartford, Builders Rochester Pet Oct 16 Ord Oct 16  
MARTIN, ARTHUR WATSON, Nottingham Nottingham Pet Oct 17 Ord Oct 17  
MARON, FRANCES ELIZABETH, Quarry Bank, nr Brierley Hill, Staffs, Brewer Stourbridge Pet Oct 8 Ord Oct 15  
METCALFE, THOMAS, Cleasby, Yorks, Farmer Stockton on Tees Pet Sept 29 Ord Oct 14  
PETERS, RICHARD ROBERT, Gt Grimsby, Fisherman Gt Grimsby Pet Oct 16 Ord Oct 16  
PLEASANTS, BENJAMIN, Norwich, Draper Norwich Pet Oct 17 Ord Oct 17  
PRICE, DAVID WILLIAM, Pontrebach, Merthyr Tydfil, Collier Merthyr Tydfil Pet Oct 16 Ord Oct 16  
REYNES, FREDERICK, South Norwood, Marble Merchant High Court Pet Oct 15 Ord Oct 15  
RICHARDS, BENJAMIN, Llandilo, Carmarthen, Butcher Carmarthen Pet Oct 17 Ord Oct 17  
SEDGWICK, JAMES, New Clothorpes, Baker Gt Grimsby Pet Oct 14 Ord Oct 14

STREET, SPENCER, Bexhill on Sea, Chemist Hastings Pet Oct 16 Ord Oct 16  
THOMSON, THOMAS, Wolverhampton, Traveller Wolverhampton Pet Oct 15 Ord Oct 25  
WHITLAW, GEORGE, Halifax, Tailor Halifax Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 17  
Amended notice substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Oct 6:  
JACOBSON, SARAH, Newcastle on Tyne, Tailor Newcastle on Tyne Pet Oct 8 Ord Oct 8

Annual Subscriptions, WHICH MUST BE PAID IN ADVANCE: SOLICITORS' JOURNAL and WEEKLY REPORTER, in Wrapper, 53s., post-free (53 Nos. 1902-3). SOLICITORS' JOURNAL only, 26s. 6d.; Country, 28s. 6d.; Foreign, 31s. WEEKLY REPORTER, in Wrapper, 26s. 6d.; Country or Foreign, 28s. 6d.

## SELDEN SOCIETY.

FOUNDED 1887.

To encourage the study and advance the knowledge of the History of English Law.

PATRON: HIS MAJESTY THE KING.

PRESIDENT: THE RIGHT HON. LORD MACAGHTEN.

VICE-PRESIDENTS: THE HON. MR. JUSTICE WILLS.

VICE-PRESIDENTS: MR. RENSCHAW, K.C.

LITERARY DIRECTOR: PROFESSOR MATTLAND.

Annual Subscription: ONE GUINEA. Life Membership (or 30 years for Libraries, &c.): TWENTY GUINEAS.

Each Member receives the publication for the year of subscription, and may subscribe for any previous year. Special arrangements for Libraries, &c., requiring a complete set of past Publications.

Hon. Secretary: MR. B. FOSSET LOCK,  
11, New-square Lincoln's-inn, W.C.

Hon. Treasurer: MR. FRANCIS K. MUTTON,  
Montpelier House, Twickenham.

Further particulars may be obtained from the Secretary or Treasurer.

NOTE.—Publications already issued (price 28s. each to Non-Members): (I.) Select Pleas of the Crown. (II.) Select Manorial Pleas. (III.) Select Civil Pleas. (IV.) The Court Baron. (V.) Lect. Jurisdiction in Norwich. (VI.) Select Admiralty Pleas (Vol. 1). (VII.) The Mirror of Justices. (VIII.) Bracton and Azo. (IX.) The Coroners' Rolls. (X.) Select Cases in Chancery. (XI.) Select Admiralty Pleas (Vol. 2). (XII.) The Court of Requests. (XIII.) Select Pleas of the Forests. (XIV.) Beverley Town Documents. (XV.) The Exchequer of the Jews.

## KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON.

"THE LAW RESTRAINING A TRADER FROM PASSING OFF HIS GOODS AS THOSE OF ANOTHER TRADER."

A Course of Four Lectures on this subject will be delivered by Professor JOHN CUTLER, M.A., K.C., on Tuesdays, November 3rd, 10th, 17th, and 24th, at 5 p.m.

Admission free by Cards, to be obtained at the Secretary's Office, King's College, Strand, W.C.

MR. F. F. MONTAGUE, LL.B., continues to PREPARE for the SOLICITORS' FINAL and INTERMEDIATE EXAMINATIONS; payment by result.—Particulars on application, personally or by letter, at 53, Chancery Lane, W.

LAW.—Junior Clerk (19), with some experience of Legal work, Requires Situation in Solicitor's Office; Typewriting (Yost), fair Shorthand.—G. C., 18, Vere-street, W.C.

LAW.—Engrossing and General Clerk, also Typewriter (Yost), Desires Re-engagement as such; 10 years' experience.—C. A. THOMPSON, care of Wortham, Nash, and King, Royston, Herts.

LAW.—Required, General Clerkship; 18 years with London solicitor (just retired); Conveyancing, High Court Chambers, Costs, &c.; highest references; abstainer; salary £130.—SYMONS, 77, Stormont-road, Lavender-hill, S.W.

5/- REWARD.—Wanted, the Name and Address of the Solicitor who took over the business of Pierce Sweeting Brisley, Solicitor, formerly of No. 23, Lawrence Pountney-lane, who died 27th September, 1881, or the present address of his widow, Mrs. Henrietta Brisley, the Executrix.—Address, P. S., at Hornonville, 61, Chapside, E.C.

MADAME AUBERT'S GOVERNESS and SCHOOL AGENCY (Established 1860), 190, Regent-street, W.—Resident, Daily, and Visiting Governesses, Lady Professors and Teachers, Répétitrices, Chaperons, Companions, Lady Housekeepers (English and Foreign) introduced for British Isles and Abroad; Schools and Educational Homes recommended.

To Students attending Legal Classes. COMFORTABLE APARTMENTS, with or without Board; bath-room and bicycle shed; terms moderate.—Apply, Mrs. L. (Widow of a Solicitor's Manager), 3, Alderbrook-road, Clapham Common (West Side), S.W.

LAW.—GREAT SAVING.—For prompt payment 25 per cent. will be taken off the following writing charges:—

Abstracts Copied	...	...	0 8 per sheet.
Briefs and Drafts	...	...	2 3 per 20 folios.
Deeds Round Hand	...	...	0 2 per folio.
Deeds Abstracted	...	...	2 0 per sheet.
Full Copies	...	...	0 2 per folio.

PAPER.—Foolscap, 1d. per sheet; Draft, ½d. ditto; Parchment, 1s. 6d. to 3s. 6d. per skin.

KERR & LANHAM, 16, Fumival-street, Holborn, E.C.

### TRUSTEE INVESTMENT.

FREEHOLD Business Premises, situated in the heart of the West End, with frontages to two thoroughfares, to be sold; let on repairing lease for 7-14-21-26 years to an extremely well-known firm at £1,200 per annum, tenants paying rates, taxes, insurance, and all outgoings; price £24,000; this may be regarded as a gilt-edged security in all respects.—Apply to the Sole Agents, MAY & BOWDEN, 39, Maddox-street, W.

£500 to £25,000, or Upwards.—Loans on permanent mortgage can be immediately arranged on good Freehold or Leasehold Securities, Reversions, Absolute Life Interests, or other eligible Securities. Weeklies not entertained. Not trust funds.—Apply, WILLIAM P. NEAL, Esq., Solicitor, Finner's Hall, Great Winchester-street, London E.C.

GROUND - RENTS, FREEHOLD and LEASEHOLD.—The Advertiser is prepared to Purchase Ground-Rents secured upon good-class property, finished or unfinished, in London or suburbs; no rubbish entertained, and no commission required, being the actual purchaser.—Care of EDGAR H. BILLINGSLAKE, Auctioneer and Surveyor, 21, Borough High-street, London Bridge.

FOR SALE.—Complete Set of the "Law Reports," including present year; price £90.—MR. GALBRAITH'S CLERK, 4, Stone-buildings, Lincoln's-inn.

### LAW PARTNERSHIPS & SUCCESSIONS.

For Vacancies in Town and Country, or for Introduction to Gentlemen requiring above, apply to

J. HARCOURT SMITH,

Partnership Agent and Law Costs Draftsman.

7, GRAY'S INN PLACE, W.C.

LATE OF 63, CHANCERY LANE.

N.B.—MORTGAGE SECURITIES WANTED.

## BRAND'S

A1

## SOUPS.

Of all Descriptions.

Finest Quality only.

Sold everywhere.

BRAND & CO., Ltd., MAYFAIR, W.

An admirable Food of the

# EPPS'S

Finest quality and flavour.

# COCOA

Nutritious and Economical.

## GENERAL REVERSIONARY AND INVESTMENT COMPANY, LIMITED.

No. 26 PAUL MALL, LONDON, S.W.

(REMOVED FROM 5 WHITEHALL.)

Established 1836, and further empowered by Special Act of Parliament, 14 & 15 Vict. c. 130.

Share and Debenture Capital ... .. £619,870.

Reversions Purchased on favourable terms. Loans on Reversions made either at annual interest or for deferred charges. Policies Purchased.

## THE REVERSIONARY INTEREST SOCIETY, LIMITED

(ESTABLISHED 1823).

Purchase Reversionary Interests in Real and Personal Property, and Life Interests and Life Policies, and Advance Money upon these Securities.

Paid-up Share and Debenture Capital, £637,525.

The Society has moved from 17, King's Arms-yard to 30, COLEMAN STREET, E.C.

## 19th CENTURY BUILDING SOCIETY.

ADOLPHUS PLACE, LONDON BRIDGE, E.C.

Assets ... .. £158,000.

CHAIRMAN:

SIR HENRY WALDEMAR LAWRENCE, BART., J.P., 2, Mitre-court-buildings, Temple, E.C.

Prompt and Liberal Advances to Purchase, Build, Improve Freehold, Leasehold, or Copyhold Property.

Borrowers Interest 4 per cent. Monthly repayments which include Principal, Premium, and Interest for each £100: 10 years, £1 1s. 1d.; 12 years, 18s. 4d.; 15 years, 15s. 6d.; 18 years, 14s. 3d.; 21 years, 12s. 11d. Survey Fee to £500, half-a-guinea.

Prospectus free of FREDERICK LONG, Manager.

## ALEXANDER & SHEPHEARD, LIMITED.

PRINTERS.

LAW and PARLIAMENTARY.

PARLIAMENTARY BILLS, MINUTES OF EVIDENCE, BOOKS OF REFERENCE, STATEMENTS OF CLAIM, ANSWERS, &c., &c.

BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, MAGAZINES,

NEWSPAPERS.

And all General and Commercial Work.

Every description of Printing.

Printers of THE SOLICITORS' JOURNAL

and WEEKLY REPORTER.

NORWICH STREET, FETTER LANE, LONDON, E.C.



S. FISHER, 188, Strand.